

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION

PART I: ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

New Hampshire adopts the five No Child Left Behind goals, the corresponding indicators, and agrees to submit targets and baseline data related to the goals and indicators identified in this application. All of the target performance indicators, as well as any additional New Hampshire goals for improving student achievement in this State, will be submitted by May 01, 2003.

The State of New Hampshire's agreement and commitment to these goals in the form of resource and/or policy development is contingent on deliberation among authorized State parties, included but not limited to, New Hampshire's State Legislature, Governor's Office, and Commissioner of Education. By State law, the acceptance of any outside funding must go before Governor and Executive Council, and any new positions, State and Federally funded, must be approved by the New Hampshire State Legislature. Finally, revisions of State statutes regarding the State assessment system and any prospective State accountability are the purview of the New Hampshire State Legislature.

PART II: STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA PROGRAMS

1. New Hampshire's Standards, Assessments and Accountability System

RSA 193-C, the New Hampshire Education Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP), is the cornerstone of the state's initiatives to continuously improve education for all students. As stated in the law, the purpose of NHEIAP is "to establish what New Hampshire students should know and be able to do and to develop and implement effective methods for assessing that learning and its application so that local decisions about curriculum development and delivery can be made."

There are three components of NHEIAP – the *curriculum frameworks*, which set the standards; *the assessment process*, which is designed to measure what our students know and are able to do in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies; and *the test results*, which provide community leaders, parents, and educators at the local level with information they need to develop plans and activities to improve their schools continually over time.

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994, and its reauthorization again in 2002, supports New Hampshire's efforts to establish challenging standards, to develop aligned assessments, and to build accountability systems for districts and schools that are based on educational results which lead to continuous improvement of teaching and learning in New Hampshire schools. New Hampshire's education community is committed to ensuring that all students are given the same opportunity to achieve high standards and are held to the same high expectations.

New Hampshire's assessment system under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act was approved by the US Department of Education in April 2002. There have been no modifications of the New Hampshire Peer Review to date.

Some critical tasks related to standards, assessments, and accountability that New Hampshire will address to ensure effective implementation of the new legislation. By addressing these tasks, the State can help ensure that standards, assessments, and accountability systems result in improved instruction in all classrooms and improved achievement for all students in New Hampshire.

- The Department of Education has established an external committee of school district personnel and local parent school board members. The committee will be expanded to include key policy members and representatives from the New Hampshire business community. The committee has been charged to prepare a report for the Commissioner of Education that will outline recommendations of Guiding Principles for developing a statewide assessment and accountability system, a system that not only complies with the new ESEA requirements but also makes the most sense for New Hampshire citizens.

In addition, during the next year, as the Department prepares its state application for ESEA, the DOE will seek input from classroom teachers around the assessment requirements, in particular seeking their input and advice on what “assessment system” would be most helpful to them in enhancing their own teaching practices, as well as enhancing student learning in their classrooms. It is anticipated that this phase of the process will be completed in the fall of 2002.

a. and b. Standards

New Hampshire has developed content standards for English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. Standards are written by grade spans, i.e. by the end-of-grade 3, by the end-of-grade 6, and by the end-of-grade 10. During the 2002-2003 school year, the state will establish specific grade level expectations and will submit targets and baseline data for the core indicators by May 2003. The state will provide evidence that these expectations have been adopted.

The state will institute two parallel efforts to create frameworks: a state effort and a regional effort (The New England Compact). The state effort will proceed in a coordinated two-step process. First, as part of our continuing commitment to improve over time, the curriculum frameworks in ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies will be reviewed and revised as necessary within the existing structure of the current grade level bands. This has begun in mathematics. The other three frameworks will follow a similar procedure: widely gathered feedback on the existing frameworks followed by intensive work on the part of a committee whose members represent all stakeholders. The New Hampshire Department of Education will seek comments statewide on these draft revisions. Second, once general statewide consensus has been reached on necessary revision to the current frameworks, work will begin on end-of-grade standards in English language arts and mathematics for grades 4, 5, 7, and 8, and in science for a grade in the 3-5 grade band. The goal is to have the process completed for ELA and mathematics by the start of the 2004-2005 school year, and for science by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. In all cases, this will allow schools and districts one year to align curriculum and one year to fully implement the aligned curriculum prior to the required statewide system of assessments.

On a parallel track, New Hampshire is interested in joining the New England Compact. One of the tasks of the New England Compact will be to create end-of-grade standards for every grade 3-8 as required by No Child Left Behind and as a necessary first step to developing an assortment of assessments that would become available to member states. Timelines for the completion of tasks have not been established yet. New Hampshire is very interested in coordinating efforts across New England and will make every effort to coordinate our statewide efforts with the New England Compact once the compact is funded.

Timeline for the state effort:

- 2002-2003 Mathematics framework
- Work to develop consensus on draft revisions
- Develop standards for grades 4, 5, 7, and 8 ELA framework
- Gather feedback on existing framework
- Review and revise as necessary existing 2003-2004 mathematics framework
- Work to set frameworks for ELA
- Develop standards for grades 4, 5, 7, and 8
- Work to get frameworks approved for 4, 5, 7 and 8
- 2004-2005 ELA and Mathematics frameworks
- Release approved documents (fall of 2004)
- Help schools align existing curriculum to state frameworks, 2005-2006 ELA and mathematics frameworks
- Implement newly aligned curriculum at the local level.
- Develop academic content standards/grade level expectations in science by 2006
- Develop and implement assessments in science in elementary (3-5), middle (6-9) and by 2007-2008 school year

c. Assessments

New Hampshire has already implemented some of the assessments required. English language arts and mathematics are currently assessed at grades 3, 6, and 10. Science is assessed at grades 6 and 10. In at least English arts and mathematics, the state will develop and administer a system of assessments, aligned to standards, to be administered in each of the grades 3 through 8, and one test in high school. Assessments will be administered in each of the required grades by 2005-2006. Evidence will be submitted by December 2006.

New Hampshire will develop and administer a science assessment, aligned to standards by 2007-2008 school year in one of the grades 3-5. New Hampshire currently assesses science, aligned to standards, in one of the grades 6-9, and one of the grades 10-12 and will continue to do that. Evidence will be submitted by December 2008.

The New Hampshire Department of Education, in consultation with the LEAs, will develop and implement assessments that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required subjects and grade levels. This will occur no later than indicated in the

schedule below. New Hampshire will provide evidence the State has developed, adjusted, and implemented the assessment system as follows:

| SUBJECT | IMPLEMENTED BY | SUBMIT EVIDENCE BY |
|----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Math 3-8 | 2005-06 | Dec. 2006 |
| RDG/ELA 3-8 | 2005-06 | Dec. 2006 |
| Science at Required Grade Levels | 2007-08 | Dec. 2008 |

d. New Hampshire's current assessment results are grouped into four performance standards (categories): novice, basic, proficient and advanced. The New Hampshire state legislature has determined that students who score at the basic, proficient, and advanced levels are making progress toward obtaining an adequate education. Students at the basic level have successfully demonstrated that they have learned fundamental information and skills. Students at the proficient and advanced levels have demonstrated the attainment of a wide-range of knowledge as well as the ability to apply that knowledge.

e. New Hampshire will determine by January 31, 2003 the starting point for adequate yearly progress (the required percentage of students demonstrating proficiency) in accordance with section 1111 (b)(2)(E). New Hampshire will also determine how the starting point will be advanced over a 12-year timeline with intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives.

f. New Hampshire will provide evidence by January 31, 2003 submission that it has a definition of AYP and associated goals and benchmarks for a 12 year period. The State's definition for AYP will include the starting point value, the intermediate goals, timeline and annual objectives. New Hampshire uses the state assessment results as the first and only screen for identifying schools in need of improvement. Graduation rates will be used as the second indicator for all public high schools. The definition of graduation rate will be consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(c)(vi) and final regulations. New Hampshire will define one additional indicator for elementary schools, one for middle schools and will also identify, at that time, any additional academic indicators the State chooses to use.

g. By January 31, 2003 New Hampshire will identify the minimum number of students that the State has determined, based on sound statistical methodology, to be sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data is used to justify this determination.

h. New Hampshire is in the process of deliberating the nature and characteristics of our approach to school accountability. In addition to the challenge of meeting the expectations of No Child Left Behind, our own State Supreme Court has ruled that we must develop a system of response to underperforming schools.

As part of our state plan to implement No Child Left Behind we will continue the policy deliberations regarding our state system. This will include a series of public engagements on the topic that will include but not be limited to: legislative leaders, business and community leaders, as well as education professionals and members of the general public.

Our goal will be to conclude these deliberations and successfully pass legislation by May 2003 that will describe and implement a single statewide system of school accountability that is compatible with the expectations of No Child Left Behind.

We will use the following guiding principles to establish such a system:

- Identify program and policy changes needed to develop a single system
- Involve a broad cross section of stakeholders
- Base accountability on a variety of measure including student assessment information
- Use AYP measures which will apply to all our schools as an indicator of school performance
- Establish adequate resources and capacity to implement said system.

i. The languages present in the student population are, in order of frequency, Spanish, Bosnian, Arabic, Portuguese, and Vietnamese. The state administers assessments in English and has no plans for administering assessments in other languages because the low numbers of each language group do not warrant the expense of developing tests. The most recent data available is for the 2001-2002 school year and was collected in October 2001 by means of the Federal LEP Identification Survey.

j. The majority of limited English proficient (LEP) students in all grades are now tested in English proficiency after enrolling in school with the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) for their grade in listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Children are usually tested again for proficiency at the end of the school year. The SEA will ensure that all LEAs in the state of New Hampshire use the IPT for an annual assessment of English proficiency beginning no later than the school year 2002-2003. During the 2002-2003 school year, the State's assessment task force and curriculum planning groups organized by the SEA will determine how to collect data on English proficiency so that baseline data can be collected with reliability and consistency, perhaps by having LEAs submit the date each child was tested and the level of fluency determined by that testing each year. The groups will also consider the adequacy of the IPT for determining comprehension skills for LEP students and, if found lacking, investigate other tests available and choose a valid and reliable test of comprehension in English proficiency for LEAs to use.

The assessment of English proficiency will be aligned with the State academic content and student academic achievement standards not later than the 2002-2003 school year. No later than the school year 2002-2003 the SEA will disseminate information to superintendents through the online "Key Messages from the New Hampshire Department of Education" regarding use of the IPT for testing English proficiency in the four domains. The guideline for selecting the IPT as the state's assessment tool is based on scientifically based research on the validity and reliability of the IPT as well as its ease of scoring.

By January 2003, New Hampshire will have policies and procedures in place that ensure that the LEAs provide the annual assessment of English language proficiency of students who are English language learners. Information regarding policies and procedures will be

disseminated to LEA administrators through the online “Key Messages from the New Hampshire Department of Education.”

k. The SEA has established standards called the *New Hampshire Curriculum Frameworks* in the Language Arts as well as mathematics, science, and social studies. The state test, the New Hampshire Educational Improvement and Assessment Program (NHEIAP), is based on the *Curriculum Frameworks*. The Language Arts standards currently include reading, writing, speaking, viewing and comprehension, but do not include speaking skills. Focus groups made up of ESOL teachers and administrators will determine annual measurable achievement objectives for proficiency in speaking and listening by the spring of 2003. Curriculum planning groups will meet in the early fall to create objectives and the testing instrument(s) to be used. Annual measurable achievement objectives in the domain of speaking will be finalized in the spring of 2003 and submitted to the USED in the May 2003 submission.

New Hampshire will develop policies and procedures by May 2003 to ensure that English language learners participate in all of the new required assessments in content areas. These policies and procedures will ensure that English language learners, who have attended school in the United States for three consecutive school years, will be academically assessed in reading/language arts and mathematics.

New Hampshire will implement policies and procedures by May 2003 to ensure that students with disabilities participate in content areas assessments for each of the new required grade levels; and determine what adaptations and accommodations may be provided to more accurately measure the performance of students with disabilities in the required grades and subjects not currently assessed. The current assessment program allows for reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with diverse learning needs necessary to measure the achievement of those students relative to New Hampshire standards.

New Hampshire will participate in the biennial state assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under the National Assessment of Educational Progress beginning in school year 2002-2003.



2. New Hampshire Process for Awarding Competitive Subgrants

All competitive grants awarded will require new recipients to describe the steps they will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in its federally-assisted program for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

1) Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)

a. Timelines

The New Hampshire Department of Education will award Even Start subgrants via a competitive application process. A Request for Proposals will be issued no later than January 2003. Notification of awards will be made by May 1, 2003. Selected grants will be funded for the period July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2007. Continuation Applications will be issued annually in May. Notification regarding continued funding will be made not later than July 1.

In the six weeks following the publication of our Even Start RFP, we will provide two technical assistance workshops for prospective applicants. These sessions will, minimally, address:

- eligibility criteria;
- required Even Start program elements (Section 1235);
- indicators of program quality;
- the four components of Even Start family literacy programs; and
- proposal selection criteria and priorities.

All applicants must file a “Letter of Intent” a month prior to the proposal due date.

Even Start proposals submitted by ‘eligible entities’ (Section 1237(b)) will be reviewed by an independent panel of at least three members, including:

- an early childhood professional;
- an adult education professional; and
- one individual with expertise in family literacy.

Additional members of the review team will include one or more of the following individuals:

- a representative of a community-based literacy organization;
- a member of a local board of education;
- a representative of a parent-child organization;
- a representative of business and industry with a commitment to education; and/or
- an individual involved in the implementation of Title I programs including Reading First or Early Reading First.

Prior to the review process, the State will provide training for the review panel. Such training will include:

- eligibility criteria;
- required Even Start program elements (Section 1235);
- indicators of program quality;
- program selection criteria and priorities; and
- proposal scoring guide and rubric.

b. Selection Criteria and How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

The point rating for evaluating each section of Even Start applications is listed in parentheses next to each section below. The independent review panel described above will award these points.

Even Start Request for Proposal Criteria are as follows:

Application Narrative (125 Points)

- **Statement of Need (10 Points)**
 - The proposal demonstrates that the area to be served has a high percentage or large number of children and families in need of Even Start services.
 - The proposal demonstrates the partnership will meet the unmet needs of targeted families by developing a new range of intensive, high-quality year-round instructional services to respond to those needs and the lack of available community resources.
- **Project Description and Management (40 points)**
 - All fifteen required elements (Section 1235) for Even Start projects, which are grounded in research and national evaluation data, are adequately addressed.
 - The application provides clear objectives and a concise description of the overall goals of the program.
 - The proposed Even Start project demonstrates the ability to develop, implement and fully integrate a family-centered education project of the size, quality, intensity and duration necessary to carry out all aspects of an Even Start program.
 - The application demonstrates how the proposed Even Start project will provide year-round services for at least a three-year range.
 - There is sufficient evidence that the project will use strategies and techniques that ensure high-quality, intensive, year-round instructional services that:
 - 1. Promote adult literacy;
 - 2. Empower parents to support the educational growth of their children;
 - 3. Provide developmentally appropriate early childhood education services; and
 - 4. Prepare young children for success in regular school programs.
 - The proposed project ensures that it will use instructional programs and reading readiness activities that are based on scientifically based reading research, to the extent such research is available.
 - There is evidence in the proposal of a range of connected project activities, including instructional home visits, designed to integrate the four program components.
 - Methods are described for addressing GEPA, Section 427 in which the program will:
 - provide services to individuals with special needs, including individuals with limited English proficiency and individuals with disabilities;
 - ensure service to families who are most in need of Even Start family literacy services; and
 - encourage participants to remain in the program for a time sufficient to meet the program's purpose.
- **Collaboration (20 points)**
 - Documentation details the specific ways in which the 'eligible entity' (Section 1237(b)) organizations and related partners will collaborate over time and how the partnership will build on existing school and community resources to effectively serve targeted children and families.

- Documentation provides an effective plan for the joint use of high-quality instructional resources.
- Plans document the tasks and responsibilities of staff in collaborating agencies.
- **Staff and Staff Development (10 points)**
 - The application provides a staffing plan for the project, and ensures that Even Start program staff meet the following requirements.
 - The project director will:
 - have obtained at least a bachelor's degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education; and
 - have received training in the operation of a family literacy program.
 - Instructional staff, in all four Even Start program components, will:
 - have obtained an associate's, bachelor's or graduate degree in a field related to early childhood education, elementary or secondary school education, or adult education.
 - Paraprofessionals will:
 - have a high school diploma, or its recognized equivalent.
 - The application describes plans for training all staff, including child care staff, to develop the skills necessary to work with parents and young children in the full range of Even Start instructional services.
- **Evaluation Plan (10 points)**
 - The evaluation plan demonstrates an ability to conduct a rigorous and objective independent local evaluation based on both the local goals and objectives, and the fifteen required Even Start program elements. (Section 1235)
 - The plan indicates how the project will measure the success of its activities in meeting the New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators.
- **Evidence of Project Potential for Meeting Local Program Goals and Objectives, and Achieving Success on New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators (10 points)**
 - The program's significance and scope are reasonable and indicate a promise of success in meeting both local goals and objectives, and New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators
 - A potentially seamless integration among program components is presented;
 - The instructional and support services described provide the quality, flexibility, intensity, and duration necessary to ensure a higher probability that children enter school prepared to learn to read, adults significantly improve their literacy skills and their ability to help their children succeed in school, and families increase their level of self-sufficiency;
 - The instructional services and activities offered are based on scientifically based reading research, to the extent such research is available;
 - An effective mechanism for partners' communication and collaboration is described.
- **The Even Start project described shows promise for providing effective models that may be adopted by other family literacy projects and other LEAs. (10 Points)**
 - The applicant's proposal:

- Meets the statutory selection criteria,
 - Effectively addresses all 15 program elements,
 - Effectively integrates all 4 program components
 - Shows great promise for providing program models that may be adopted by other family literacy projects and LEAs.
 - **Budget (10 points)**
 - The applicant demonstrates that the proposed budget is cost-effective given the scope of project activities and the number of people served.
 - All matching and in-kind dollars are clearly indicated and the proposal includes the appropriate local share of total project costs.
 - **The project described is representative of urban and rural areas of the State. (5 points)**
 - The proposal meets all the statutory selection criteria, AND
 - Is representative of an urban and/or rural area of New Hampshire.
-

c. Priorities and How They Will Promote Improved Academic Achievement

In the event two or more proposals tie in the scoring process, priority will be given to those proposals that demonstrate the highest potential for promoting improved academic achievement as evidenced by their achieving the highest scores in the following sections for the Application Narrative:

- Evidence of Project Potential for Meeting Local Program Goals and Objectives, and Achieving Success on New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators;
- Project Description sections of the Application Narrative; and
- Project shows promise for providing effective models that may be adopted by other family literacy projects and other LEAs.

Up to 10 additional priority points will be given to applicants that provide substantial documentation demonstrating services targeted primarily to families:

- Most in need, based on demographic need factors; and/or
- Residing in empowerment zones or enterprise communities.

2) Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)

The Migrant Education Program in the State of New Hampshire does not subgrant at this time.

3) a.b.c. Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk – Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)

Local Agency Program funds are awarded on a formula basis to school districts that meet the eligibility thresholds set by the state. The SEA annually sets thresholds in regards to high numbers or high percentages of children and youth residing in locally operated institutions.

The State uses a formula basis for awarding these funds and will not at any time during the duration of the No Child Left Behind Act distribute these funds through a competitive

process. If, at any point, the Department wishes to change their procedures in dealing with these funds, they will amend their State plan and request approval from the USDOE. The plan amendment will address a timeline, selection criteria, grant award processes and the LEA requirements listed in section 1423. Also at that time, the State will determine if it wants to set priorities for these funds.

Upon receipt of the grant award figures from the US Department of Education, the Title I State Coordinator determines which LEAs qualify for Title I Part D, subpart 2 grants. Using the data collected the previous fall through the Annual Report for Neglected and Delinquent, the Title I Office lists all LEAs that contributed to the count. We identify a LEA as eligible if its count of students is equal to or greater than five students. (Counts range between 1-16.) The number five was selected because it indicates a significant impact on a school district; and it will generate sufficient funds to support a program in regards to size, scope and quality.

We next determine the total count of students in eligible LEAs and calculate a per-pupil amount by dividing the total number into available dollars. LEA allocations are determined by multiplying student counts by the per-pupil dollar amount.

Each eligible LEA receives a formal notice of its allocation along with an application for funds. Applications were updated to include all requirements of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. Grants generally run from ten to twelve months each year.

4) Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) (Title I, Part F)

a. Timeline

The New Hampshire Department of Education will award CSR grants via a competitive process. A Request for Proposals will be issued no later than January 2003. All perspective applicants must file a "Letter of Intent" by November 1, 2003. Prior to the publication of the RFP at least two technical assistance workshops will be provided. Selected grants will be funded for the period July 1, 2003 – June 30, 2006. In the six weeks following the publication of our RFP, we will provide at least one technical assistance workshop for prospective applicants.

Once funded, at the end of each implementation year the New Hampshire Department of Education will require each school to submit a Local Progress Report Form.

Key Procedures

The New Hampshire Department of Education in accordance with Section 1603(b), will ensure the following process and selection criteria in funding CSR grants:

To be considered "comprehensive", a reform program must:

- include each of the eleven specific components outlined in section 1606 (a);
- have the capacity to improve the academic achievement of all students in core academic subjects;

- be supported by high quality technical assistance providers that have a successful track record, financial stability, and the capacity to deliver high quality materials, professional development for school personnel, and on-site support during the full implementation period of the reforms; or
- be found, through scientifically based research, to improve significantly the academic achievement of participating students, or be found to have strong evidence that it will accomplish this goal.

To be considered for CSR funds a district or school must indicate how it has begun to foster whole-school change to enable all students to meet challenging state learning and performance standards.

Funding Process: As determined by appropriation process

- Title I CSR funds will be awarded only to schools who are eligible to receive Title I funds.
- For each fiscal year funds may be allocated to Title I and non-Title I schools under the Title I No Child Left Behind Funds to Improve Education Act (FIE).

To the extent possible, the New Hampshire Department of Education will fund districts and schools that represent geographical and demographic diversity and grade-level variety.

b. Selection Criteria

We encourage all schools, Title I Schools, Schoolwide schools, schools with high poverty, high dropout and/or retention rates, poor school attendance and demonstration of low student achievement to apply.

- A school district must file a “Letter of Intent.”
- The school for which funding is being applied must have an active school reform planning team, a completed Title I Schoolwide plan or other school improvement plan.
- A school planning team must attend the two required training days:
Day 1 – encompasses the history and purpose of CSR, overview of the eleven components, building staff ownership, planning for change, and planning for reform.
Day 2 – encompasses collecting data, developing needs assessments, prioritizing schools needs, resources and reform model selections.
- The school must have a district-designated person who will be the contact for ongoing technical assistance with any model provider.
- An application must be submitted by the district describing how the district will provide ongoing support and that the district agrees to assist the school in developing a local evaluation of the comprehensive school reform effort.
- The school must complete a Request for Proposal application which describes how the school intends to implement the eleven components of a CSR Program.

c. Priorities

Request for Proposal is as follows:

Comprehensive School Reform Request for Proposal

I. District Application (55 points)

- **District Profile (16 points)**
 - Basic information about the district and how the district has been involved in the planning and helping the school align their plan with the state frameworks and standards.
- **Narrative description of the district's responsibilities (31 points)**
 - How the district will provide on-going assistance
 - How the district will continue support after three years
 - How the district will assist in the local evaluation
- **Letter of Commitment (7 points)**
 - The district must provide evidence, in the form of a letter, showing support for the CSR reform and the external provider.
- **Assurances (1 point)**
 - The district must provide a signed "Assurances" form signed by the superintendent.

II. School Application (102 points)

- **School Profile (7 points)**
 - Basic information about the school providing a description of the school, including students, staff, and community demographics.
 - Identify why the school is ready to undertake a comprehensive reform effort.
- **Needs Assessment Process (15 points)**
 - Opening statement
 - Summary of the results
 - Completion of the New Hampshire Education Improvement Assessment Plan (NHEIAP) data grid
 - 2 – 3 goals or benchmarks
 - Description of the needs assessment process
- **Planning Process (12 points)**
 - Describe the process used to plan the school's proposed CSR program.
 - Include a timeline in which the process was undertaken.
 - List the members of the CSR team and describe their role in the schools.
- **School Reform Model (5 points)**
 - Name the school reform model the school wishes to adopt.
 - Describe how the model meets the school's needs as determined by the needs assessment.
 - Provide evidence of 3-years of scientifically research-based data
- **Action Plan (45 points)**
 - Indicate what action steps the school will engage in to address all eleven components of the CSR project.
 - Provide evidence that it is part of a whole school reform effort and not an "add-on."
 - List measurable goals and objectives for each component area.

- Relate or clearly relate objectives to the needs assessment and match benchmarks.
- **Changes in Existing Program (10 points)**
 - Identify how the comprehensive school reform effort will change the school's existing program(s) and/or "the way it does business."
- **Letters of Commitment (8 points)**
 - Provide a letter of commitment signed by at least 80% of the staff. The commitment must include the agreement to participate in all state and federal activities including, but not limited to, evaluation, data collection and reporting, networking meetings, etc.
 - Provide a letter of commitment from the model provider indicating that they have agreed to work with the school for the next three years.

III. Priority Points (13 points)

New Hampshire Department of Education will give priority funding to districts who:

- Are a Title I Schoolwide School In Need of Improvement that has been identified under Title I Section 1116(c) as "in need of improvement or corrective action" as determined by the New Hampshire Department of Education's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) definition based on two consecutive years of lack of progress in student achievement. A Title I Schoolwide school has 40% poverty or higher AND has a Title I Schoolwide plan accepted by and on file with the New Hampshire Department of Education. **(10 points)**
- Are a Title I Targeted Assistance School In Need of Improvement that has been identified under Title I Section 1116(c) as "in need of improvement or corrective action" as determined by the New Hampshire Department of Education's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) definition, based on two consecutive years of lack of progress in student achievement. **(8points)**
- Are a Title I Schoolwide School having a poverty level over 40% based on free and reduced lunch data. **(6 points)**
- Have a letter of Intent to Apply on file at the New Hampshire Department of Education. **(1 point)**
- Attended the two CSR workshops. **(2 points)**
- Attended only one CSR workshop. **(1 point)**

IV. On-Site Visit (20 points)

- All concerns by readers are answered and reflect a CSR approach
- CSR is understood and supported by all participants in the school community
- District support is clear and well defined
- All interview questions are satisfactorily addressed

CSR Review Process/ Preparing schools to apply/ Preparing readers

Each CSR school conducts yearly in-house local evaluations. Their reports reflect data collection on the eleven components of CSR as well as student performance based on the New Hampshire Educational Improvement Assessment Test.

Working with the school districts the New Hampshire Department of Education will assist schools in collecting and disaggregating the results of the state assessment for each school. Reflections on this data are an integral part of each school's continuation application.

- **CSR Workshop I** – All school districts are invited to attend an all day workshop. The workshop encompasses the history and purpose of CSR, overview of the eleven components, building staff ownership, planning for change, and planning for reform.
- **CSR Workshop II** – All school districts are invited to attend an all day workshop. This workshop encompasses developing needs assessments, prioritizing schools needs, resources and reform model selections.
- **CSR Workshop III - Request for Proposal Review** – Request for Proposals are mailed and sent electronically to all Title I project managers and superintendents. All school districts are invited to attend a workshop explaining in detail the RFP application, what is expected from each school in the application, and the scoring rubric.

Each proposal will be read and scored using a scoring rubric, by at least three grant reviewers comprised of persons from the DOE and local educators, each of whom have significant experience and expertise in CSR and grant reviewing.

- **Grant Readers Workshop I** – A grant readers' workshop will be conducted to review the Request for Proposal and explain the scoring rubric.
- **Grant Readers Review Workshop II** – A meeting will be held with all grant readers to discuss individual grants to determine which will receive a site visit and possible funding.
- **On-site school visits** - A team of grant readers will conduct on-sight school visits to finalize the grant application and determine final funding.

5) Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund – subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)

The primary goal for the use of these funds in New Hampshire will be to provide sustained, high quality professional development for paraprofessionals, teachers and school leaders who are currently employed in the schools of the State.

a. Timeline

The New Hampshire Department of Education will award funds to eligible partners through a competitive process. A Request for Proposals will be issued no later than July 1, 2002. A bidder's conference will be held during July 2002. Grant applications will be received until August 15, 2002 and awards will be announced September 13, 2002. To allow for contracts to complete the required Governor and Council process, the grant period will be December 1, 2002 to November 30, 2003.

b. Selection Criteria

The following selection criteria will promote improved academic achievement by giving those who deliver and oversee instruction greater knowledge of and more strategies for teaching core academic subjects.

1. Planning (15 points)

The proposed project is a result of a cooperative effort between an eligible partner and one or more local school districts. In particular, those who will benefit from the grant will be involved in the planning.

2. Quality of the project (35 points)

- The project is logical, clear and relevant to the academic needs of children and/or youth,
- The project addresses local needs for the improvement of instruction in the core academic areas and is connected to the districts' local professional development master plan,
- Project activities are clearly related to the objectives and show evidence that they provide the conditions that lead to the anticipated outcomes, can be accomplished in the stated time and have the potential for significant impact on student learning,
- Project activities are sustained, intensive and of high quality,
- Project activities are based on scientifically based practices,
- The project takes into account the need for greater access for teachers of students from historically underrepresented and under-served groups and gifted and talented students.

3. Management and staff (15 points)

- The management plan gives evidence of good administrative practice, including criteria and procedures for selecting participants, as well as a systematic means of monitoring the progress of the project and making program modifications as necessary,
- The qualifications and responsibilities of the staff are appropriate for the proposed project,
- The eligible partner has prior, demonstrated experience in providing professional development programs related to the RFP proposal.

4. Evaluation (20 points)

The evaluation plan clearly indicates criteria and a process for determining the effectiveness of project activities.

5. Budget (20 points)

The budget is appropriate for the proposed activities and is consistent with the use of funds as stated in the RFP.

c. Priorities And How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

- Alignment of professional development activities with the New Hampshire Curriculum Frameworks and with standards for the certification and recertification of teachers will ensure that educators possess the knowledge and skill to improve student achievement in the core academic areas.
- Equitable geographic distribution of sub-grants will ensure that students throughout the state are taught by highly qualified teachers.

- Coordination of the activities funded under this subpart with those funded under the State's Transition to Teaching and Troops to Teachers grants will increase the number of classes taught by highly qualified educators.
- State paraprofessionals will be well prepared to teach reading and mathematics.

6) Enhanced Education Through Technology

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2002) offers New Hampshire an opportunity to comprehensively plan for improved educational outcomes throughout the state. Although the New Hampshire Educational Technology Plan directly addresses the state's educational technology vision, it provides the initial steps for the New Hampshire Department of Education to combine efforts with local educational support centers for a school support delivery system. A high need school district may apply individually to be a center; however, additional points will be awarded for consortia of school districts.

Funding received through Title II Subpart D: Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2) from No Child Left Behind and local school district (LEA) dollars will create the foundation for this support delivery system in the first years of this plan. In subsequent years, funding will be leveraged from foundation and other grant opportunities, including federal funding within other titles under No Child Left Behind. New Hampshire has also begun the process of seeking state funding to coordinate with this initiative.

New Hampshire school districts are required to have an approved school district technology plan on file with the New Hampshire Department of Education to be eligible for formula and competitive funds through E2T2. These local technology plans must meet all the criteria outlined within the *State of New Hampshire Educational Technology Plan* available at: <http://nheon.org/oet/stateplan/nhttp2002.htm>. School districts receiving formula funds will be encouraged to use 75% of the funds for hardware purchases and to use the remaining 25% to encourage participation in professional development activities as outlined in the competitive subgrants below.

The New Hampshire Office of Educational Technology (NH OET) will be responsible for the oversight of E2T2 funding. E2T2 competitive funding will be focused upon the delivery of professional development equitably across the state. This focus is the result of many factors:

1. Current research indicates that once access to technology has been provided for, an investment is needed in professional development to impact student achievement.
2. The dollars allocated to New Hampshire through E2T2 will have limited impact across the state if their purpose is not focused.
3. Many of the school districts will be receiving formula allocations that are insufficient to have an impact on their district.

4. Aggregating our competitive dollars through consortia of school districts will enable school districts, particularly high need school districts, to take advantage of professional development opportunities not available on a small scale.
5. We recognize the ability to leverage more dollars for this purpose from other state administered funds.

a. Timeline and Activities

1. In year one, an initial Request for Proposals (RFP) will be released to the field (expected to be June 30, 2002 in year one). Up to twenty (10) teams, each including two high poverty school districts (50% or higher of their students in poverty) and one other potential consortia partner representative will be selected to develop a comprehensive plan to form a local educational support center. Applications for this original competition will have at most a two-month window. A school district member of an applicant consortium is the only member of the partnership that may serve as fiscal agent.
2. Applicants selected from the original competition will be given a high-end laptop and projector to be retained by the high poverty school districts. The equipment will be used to conduct regional outreach to form a more diverse consortium and develop a three-year comprehensive plan to be a regional consortium. At a minimum, each consortium must include two additional school districts (for a minimum total of four school districts) and a higher education partner. Deadlines for consortia plans will be within five months from the original release date of the RFP. School districts included within the consortia must submit a district technology plan at this time.
3. Submitted three-year comprehensive plans will be evaluated by New Hampshire Department of Education staff and professionals from the field against a rubric incorporating elements of this technology plan. Final selection of consortia will also be dependent upon the regional location of the consortia in order to provide equitable distribution across the state and to provide for both urban and rural needs. Comprehensive plans must have a primary focus on how they will meet the needs of high need school districts.
4. By July 1, 2003, E2T2 competitive grants will fund four local educational support centers, initially focused on professional development for the use of technology, throughout the state. Through this competitive process, consortia consisting of at least one high poverty school district, other school districts, institutes of higher education, vocational centers, non-profit organizations, and other entities will be selected for this first cohort. Each center will be awarded \$250,000 from E2T2 for the first year of operation. These four centers will then be offered an opportunity to reapply for \$150,000 from E2T2 in the second year and \$100,000 from E2T2 in the third year. It is expected that these centers will actively seek other sources of revenue to operate beyond year three.
5. Subsequent year two and year three awards will be contingent upon successful agency performance as determined by contract reports and a midyear monitoring visit by New Hampshire Department of Education. A Request for Continuation

(RFC) process will be used to solicit annual program and spending plans necessary to support subsequent year contracts. Funding for these centers will be in the Spring of each year.

6. By July 1, 2004, E2T2 competitive grants will fund up to a total of seven local educational support centers throughout the state. There will be four local educational support centers from Cohort I and an additional three centers, forming Cohort II, which will follow the same funding cycle as Cohort I.
7. By July 1, 2005, E2T2 competitive grants will fund up to a total of ten local educational support centers throughout the state. This will put 94% of all New Hampshire school districts within a 30 mile radius of at least one local educational support center. The remaining 6% of school districts, located in the north of the state, would be within less than a 50 mile radius of the nearest local educational support center.
8. The following table is a timeline of the funding structure from E2T2 funds outlined above. Any competitive funds remaining will be allocated to local educational support centers for special projects related to state initiatives.

| Center | Year One Funding | Year Two Funding | Year Three Funding | Year Four Funding | Year Five Funding |
|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | | |
| 2 | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | | |
| 3 | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | | |
| 4 | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | | |
| 5 | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | |
| 6 | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | |
| 7 | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 | |
| 8 | | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 |
| 9 | | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 |
| 10 | | | \$250,000 | \$150,000 | \$100,000 |
| Total | \$1,000,000 | \$1,350,000 | \$1,600,000 | \$750,000 | \$300,000 |

9. School districts not included within the original local educational support center consortia may take advantage of the services provided through E2T2 funding at the local educational support centers only if they have an approved technology plan on file with the New Hampshire Department of Education.
10. Whenever possible, New Hampshire Department of Education administrators of other ESEA programs will be encouraged to use the resources at the local educational support center and to provide services through this network. This

network will be a strong support for those schools not meeting annual yearly progress.

11. Local districts will be encouraged to participate in professional development opportunities by providing reasonable access, support, and incentives to their staff. Incentives may include:
 - i. Professional development allocations from school district formula funds (minimum of 25% of school district formula funds) to school districts may be used to offer stipends to participating staff.
 - ii. Priority registration may be given to school districts that have membership in the consortia or provide services to the region through the center.
12. Consortia plans that leverage E2T2 formula allocations from school districts in combination with competitive funds are preferred.

b. Selection Criteria

Specific final criteria and the rubric by which final applications will be evaluated will be developed together with our stakeholders. These stakeholders will have been identified as successful applicants from the original competition. Final applications to be a local educational support center will be evaluated on the Quality of the Project (25%); Ability to Deliver State Level Initiatives as Outlined in our Technology Plan, particularly assisting high need school districts to benefit from them (25%); Budget (25%); and Evaluation Process (25%).

c. Priorities and how they will promote academic achievement

The mission of New Hampshire's Educational Support Delivery System is to offer a comprehensive statewide system for sharing high-quality educational practices, based upon scientific research to meet the needs of all learners in New Hampshire. These centers will be able to provide resources and a supportive environment responsive to local needs. These centers will facilitate communication between the state and local levels.

While E2T2 dollars are focused upon high poverty LEAs, the New Hampshire Department of Education believes that those dollars will be most effective if they can be used within consortia of school districts that include the most needy as well as districts capable of leading the way with the integration of technology. Consortia of institutions of higher education, vocational centers, business and industry, profit and non-profit organizations, as well as school districts from all levels of economic need will form support centers located throughout New Hampshire. This vision includes ten centers throughout the state. These centers would have the capacity to provide:

1. Professional development opportunities, especially assistance to educators with initial steps to take advantage of distance learning opportunities. Support center staff would have to include those with significant and diverse expertise in areas of technology integration. A minimum of 50% of professional development offerings should be delivered by educators currently employed by school districts in the region.

2. Easily accessed sites where equipment and experts for a variety of technologies, including synchronous, multi-point video conferencing are located. This specifically includes bandwidth availability to host websites that mirror state initiatives such as on-line testing/surveys.
3. Staff to aggregate LEA technology purchases including hardware, software, and connectivity. This would include working directly with LEA curriculum and technology directors, as well as staff at other local educational support centers and NH OET staff.
4. Assistance to districts applying for grant opportunities and e-rate. This would include working directly with LEA business administrators.
5. Assistance with state and federal assessments and evaluations, facilitated by technology tools, offering data to inform decision making by all stakeholders.
6. Data warehousing services, file servers, and filtering solutions.
7. Coordination of programs provided by individuals and organizations that meet the needs of students, families, and community members.
8. Organizing and staffing an Oversight Committee to include stakeholder representation from:
 - a. superintendents
 - b. principals
 - c. school instructional staff
 - d. ancillary school staff
 - e. parents
 - f. school boards
 - g. institution(s) of higher education
 - h. business and/or industry (optional)
 - i. non-profit organizations (optional)
9. Ensuring that the Oversight Committee meets regularly to be certain that identified local needs are being addressed. The Oversight Committee must actively seek input from teachers, school staff, parents, and students to determine ongoing needs of students and families.
10. Local Center Oversight Committee members will participate on the New Hampshire State Technology Council on a rotating basis. Technology Council terms will be staggered to maintain continuity and allow for growth. Policy for specific stakeholder representation will be developed.

11. Organize and oversee a local needs assessment process and implement strategies to strengthen community relationships.
(See www.communityschools.org/tech.html)

These educational support centers as funded with E2T2 dollars will initially be focused upon assisting high need school districts with the integration of technology into the curriculum. However, these centers can expand their offerings with funding from other sources such as other federal funds, foundation support, support from business and industry, and ultimately New Hampshire state dollars. The local educational support center model is currently used with many of the special education, vocational education, and distance learning dollars available to New Hampshire. Local educational support centers having an educational technology focus are a step forward in creating a comprehensive educational support system. Activities currently conducted regionally will be tied to the centers begun as a result of this plan.

The educational support system model will enable services to be tailored to unique local needs. The centers will provide a mechanism for sharing information, troubleshooting, and implementing solutions locally. This model for educational outreach will also facilitate partnerships between schools and community-based organizations.

Program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that New Hampshire has established are all outlined within the State Educational Technology Plan available at our web site: [www. http://nheon.org/oet/stateplan/nhtp2002.htm](http://nheon.org/oet/stateplan/nhtp2002.htm).

7) Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities – Reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, Section 4112)

a. Timeline

The New Hampshire Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery, acting as administering agency, will award Governor's Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities grants via a competitive process. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be issued by the end of June 2002 and a technical assistance workshop will be scheduled within two weeks of the release date. Applications will be due six weeks after the release date and funds will be available to the selected grantees by November 2002, according to the State of New Hampshire contract approval procedures.

The RFP will be released using multiple mechanisms to ensure all eligible applicants are aware of the availability of funds. These mechanisms will include a one-page distribution plan disseminated to schools and prevention providers by the end of May 2002; a legal notice in the statewide newspaper; notices sent via various listservs, including schools; and by mail to prevention and youth services providers.

All applications deemed to meet submission criteria (e.g., on-time, eligible, complete) will be peer reviewed by a team consisting of community representatives, prevention

providers, and state agency staff. The peer review team will receive guidance on reading and scoring applications according to selection criteria included in the RFP.

b. Selection Criteria And How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Selection criteria for Governor's Program recipients are divided into three categories:

- Compliance Criteria
- Technical Merit of Application
- Ensuring Fair Statewide Distribution of Funds

The selection criteria have been designed to ensure that funds are used to support effective programs that target children and youth most likely to experience risk factors associated with poor school performance, such as:

- Alienation/Rebelliousness
- Friends who Engage in Substance Use
- Favorable Attitudes Toward Substance Use
- Constitutional Factors (youth who are sensation-seekers, have low harm-avoidance, and a lack of impulse control)
- Family Management Problems
- Parental Attitudes and Involvement in Drug Use, Crime, and Violence
- Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior
- Transitions and Mobility
- Extreme Economic Deprivation

Efforts to decrease these risk factors and to improve protective factors in these youth should increase the likelihood they stay effectively engaged in school.

Compliance Criteria: Applications will be reviewed for eligibility, timeliness, and completeness before being referred on for technical review.

- Eligibility: Eligible applicants include local educational agencies, community-based organizations (including community substance abuse prevention coalitions), other public entities, and private organizations, and consortia thereof.
- Timeliness: Applications not received by the clearly stated deadline may be rejected without technical review.
- Completeness: All relevant sections of the application must be complete as indicated in the instructions before an application will be referred on for technical review.

Technical Merit of Application: Applications that meet the compliance criteria will be peer reviewed according to the following considerations:

- How the program demonstrates consistency with funding priorities and ability to serve populations indicated [20% of total score]; and
- How the program meets the Principles of Effectiveness [40% of total score], including:
 - The quality of the program or activity proposed;
 - Clear discussion of how the program activities are linked to achieving goals and objectives; and

- How the program complements and supports activities of LEA described in section 4115(b) [20% of total score].
- Demonstrated capacity to implement the program through a clear workplan and a history of effectively implementing like programs [20% of total score].

Ensuring Fair Statewide Distribution of Funds: Before final funding decisions are made, the recommendations will be reviewed to ensure a roughly equitable geographic distribution of funds. New Hampshire is divided into five Executive Council Districts, each with an elected Executive Councilor. Among other things, the five Executive Councilors are responsible for ensuring that resources are equitably distributed throughout the state and they, along with the Governor, approve all state-initiated contracts in excess of \$5000. It is customary to consider statewide distribution when making funding decisions.

The New Hampshire Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery uses a three-stage review process for all applications. This will be applied to the Governor's Program Application as follows:

1. Compliance Review – DADAPR reserves the right to refuse to review incomplete applications.
2. Technical Peer Review – Each application will be reviewed and scored using the merit criteria discussed above.
3. Final Review – DADAPR will consider the following criteria when developing final recommendations:
 - Technical Review Score
 - Geographic Distribution of Programs/Funds

c. Priorities And How They Promote Improved Academic Achievement

Governor's Program awards will be prioritized to enhance and support, but not duplicate, LEA activities by focusing on:

- A. Programs and activities provided during non-school hours, or in community settings, to high risk and/or underserved populations –
 - Alternative activities directed at high risk and/or underserved populations such as high school students, runaway and homeless youth, pregnant and parenting teens.
 - Parenting programs for high-risk families, especially programs that are family-based (parent and child together) and serve parents of pre-school children and/or high risk school-aged youth.
- B. Early intervention programs and activities that reduce alcohol and drug use and related problems among youth who have demonstrated high risk behaviors through activities such as problem identification and referral; juvenile court diversion; or alternative to suspension options. These programs may be provided in school or community settings.

The funding priorities are consistent with the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, Title IV, Part A, section 4112 and ensure that funded programs and activities will be used to provide special or remedial attention to youth most likely to experience risk factors associated with poor school performance, as discussed under Selection Criteria above. The funding priorities are consistent with the youth development priorities of the Governor and her Kids Cabinet and complement other funding sources currently available for related programming in New Hampshire.

Twenty (20) percent of each application's score will come from how well the program demonstrates its consistency with funding priorities and its ability to serve the populations indicated. Reviewers will be asked to assign a score using a Likert-like scale to ensure that responses are truly reflective of the application quality. For example, the reviewer may be asked to choose a score as follows:

- 20 Pts. Application demonstrates a clear and complete match with funding priorities.
- 10 Pts. Application demonstrates an overlap with funding priorities but questions remain about capacity or strength of focus.
- 0 Pts. Priorities are not the focus of the application.

We believe this approach, which will be followed with other selection criteria, will ask reviewers to be more objective about their scoring and will allow the differences between applications to become clear.

8) Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, Section 4126)

a) Timeline

There are no state statutes in New Hampshire requiring or governing community service programs for expelled or suspended students. As a result, the SEA does not operate such programs. Any programs or services for expelled or suspended students offered at the LEA level are locally determined and financed. LEAs electing to operate such programs most often provide tutorial support and short-term counseling services designed to help the student take personal responsibility and prepare for re-entry into the school. Such programs may or may not include a community service component.

To assess the breadth and scope of programs in New Hampshire for suspended and expelled students, the SEA will convene a focus group by September 15, 2002. Invitees will include representatives from LEAs and other entities in the state with experience in providing services or operating programs, such as community service, service learning, or character education programs, to expelled or suspended students. A Request for Proposals will subsequently be developed and issued by November 1, 2002 in accordance with competitive bidding advertising procedures of the State of New Hampshire.

b. Selection Criteria

Eligible Applicants. All LEAs in New Hampshire will be eligible to submit a proposal. Entities other than LEAs, such as private non-profit youth-serving organizations demonstrating the capacity and experience in serving suspended or expelled students will also be eligible to submit a proposal, either independently or in partnership with one or more LEAs. Completed proposals must demonstrate community service as a required component of their overall program in order to be eligible for consideration.

Review Process. A peer review process will be established for reviewing proposals submitted under this subpart. Reviewers will be solicited from LEAs, youth-serving organizations, and relevant juvenile justice, human services, and educational organizations at the local and state level.

Distribution of Funds. To the extent possible, awards from this grant will represent geographical and demographic diversity and grade-level variety. All awards will be in the form of contracts in accordance with the contracting procedures of the State of New Hampshire, which require the development of an RFP, advertisement of such in a statewide newspaper, and a peer review of RFPs submitted in response to the solicitation. Entities recommended for funding must develop contracts subject to the review and approval of the State Attorney General's office, the Governor's Office, and the Governor's Executive Council.

c. Priorities and How They Promote Improved Student Achievement

Priority will be given to proposals demonstrating a comprehensive program for expelled or suspended students addressing not only the required component of community service but also the educational needs of the student during the term of expulsion or suspension. Priority will also be given to entities providing community service programs for large numbers of suspended or expelled students.

While applicants will be required to submit a proposal describing all components of their program, Community Service Grant funds will be awarded for only certain components of an overall program. Community Service Grant funds will be awarded to entities providing:

- a community service component engaging students in authentic activities for the benefit of the community, and
- as a transitional activity designed to prepare the student to re-enter school, the provision of brief intervention services designed to help the student learn skills for making positive choices and assume personal responsibility for one's decisions.

Applicants demonstrating a comprehensive program for serving large numbers of suspended or expelled students will also be given priority consideration.

9) 21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

New Hampshire's State Department of Education will be the responsible agent for the administration and supervision of programs assisted under 21st Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) funding.

a. Timeline

The timeline for 21st Century Community Learning Center grant competitions and awards is as follows:

| Month, Year | Task |
|------------------------|---|
| July/August 2002 | Write RFP |
| August 2002 | 21 st Century Application- RFP distributed to Title 1 schools, Youth Service Bureau Directors, Community Based Organization Directors, Extended School Hour Grant Managers |
| | RFP posted on New Hampshire Department of Education website |
| October 7, 2002 | Provide Technical Support/Bidder's Conference |
| November 15, 2002 | 21 st CCLC Application Deadline |
| November 18 & 29, 2002 | Peer Review Team Review of Applications |
| December 2002 | Grant Award Notices Mailed |
| January 2, 2003 | Awards Begin |

b. Selection Criteria

The State conducted a forum on April 16 , 2002 and identified the following as criteria for reviewing applications:

Up to 10 Competitive Priority Points will be given based on the quality of collaboration to those applications that clearly meet or exceed the grant requirements to:

- Serve students attending schools identified for improvement under Title I, Title I Schoolwide Schools, and Schools with 30% of students from low income families, and
- Are submitted jointly by at least one LEA and at least one public or private community organization.

Up to 5 Competitive Priority Points will be awarded to proposals that demonstrate that the eligible entity has experience, or promise of success, in providing educational and related activities that will complement and enhance the academic performance, achievement, and positive youth development of the students.

In the competitive RFP plans applicants will be asked to incorporate the priorities listed above in their program design. The criteria in this design will be weighted as follows: Statement of Need (10 points), Project Design (25 points), Adequacy of Resources (15 points), Management Plan (20 points), Evaluation Design (20 points), and Budget Narrative (10 points).

Awards will be granted for three to five years ranging from \$50,000 to \$125,000 per site per year with descending funding as follows:

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------|
| Years 1, 2, 3 | 100% funding |
| Year 4 | 75% of original funding |
| Year 5 | 50% of original funding |

At no time will grant awards go below \$50,000.

Matching funds will be encouraged but not mandatory for awards.

Training and Mentoring

The State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's and those entities' own performance goals and objectives. The State will monitor programs through telephone calls, site visits as funding allows, and required reports. Grantees will be required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) that describes project activities, accomplishments, and outcomes. The two purposes of the APR are to (1) demonstrate that substantial progress has been made toward meeting the objectives of the project as outlined in the grant application, and (2) collect data that addresses the performance indicators for the 21st Century Community Learning Center program. Details about the APR and performance standards will be provided in the summer technical assistance workshop.

Additionally a funded applicant will be notified about the 21st CCLC Summer Institute, NCCE Regional training, PlusTime New Hampshire's technical assistance and training, and other professional development opportunities. Funding for training must be included in the grant and will be outlined in the RFP.

The State commits to identifying the percentage of students participating in 21st Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics. The State will collect the baseline data for the 2001-2003 school year, and submit all of these data to the Department no later than early September 2003.

c. Priorities

The focus of the RFP is to assist agencies providing services to students in grades K-12 to:

- Provide opportunities for academic enrichment, including providing tutorial services to help students who attend low-performing schools, to meet state and

local student performance standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and mathematics;

- Offer students a broad array of additional services, programs, and activities, such as youth development activities, drug and violence prevention programs, counseling programs, art, music, and recreation programs, technology education programs, and character education programs, that are designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program of participating students; and
- Offer families of students served by community learning centers opportunities for literacy and related educational development.

In addition to addressing the priorities, applicants must also include a preliminary plan for the sustainability of the 21st CCLC after Federal funding ends, address how the transportation needs of participants will be met in the Program Design and Budget Narrative; how strong collaboration will be accomplished in the Project Design, Management Plan, and Adequacy of Resources; the quality of the project in the Project Design, and Management Plan; the history of success in the Adequacy of Resources and Management Plan; and the promise of success in the Project Design and Management Plan. All of these will be key criteria built into the priorities and ESEA Goals 1, 2, and 5, specific to 21st CCLC programs. Selection criteria, as outlined, will reflect these key overarching priorities and will be addressed specifically in the RFP Evaluation Plan.



3. New Hampshire will Monitor and Provide Professional Development and Technical Assistance to LEAs, Schools and Other Subgrantees

Districts and eligible entities will be required to have detailed plans of action for each of the projects for which they make competitive application. These plans will enumerate their performance indicators as well as their use of scientifically based research. New Hampshire Department of Education will provide professional development for these two cornerstones of No Child Left Behind. Plans will not be approved that do not adequately address these two specific criteria. The Department will also offer professional development to help LEAs, schools and other subgrantees to identify and implement effective instructional programs and practices. Technical assistance will be provided to the districts or other eligible entities to assist them to clarify the connection between program performance indicators, and instruction and professional development that are based on scientifically based research. New Hampshire will continue to develop technology and database systems that enable the schools, districts and State to collect and analyze data efficiently and effectively for program improvement and accountability. Subgrantees will have links to the regional comprehensive centers. New Hampshire is a small state with many districts proportionate to its size. Technical assistance will be provided through phone, website, study groups, workshops, and monitoring visits. All projects will be required to submit performance data on their indicators to assist them and the State to identify strengths and weaknesses and create systems of continuous improvement.

In addition to the yearly state assessment data, state reviews of performance will include: school report cards, evaluation and performance reports, pre and post tests data, graduation and GED rates and employment data if relevant to the program performance. State assessment data through AYP will identify schools in need of improvement, corrective action and restructuring. This yearly data will dictate which LEA's receive monitoring and assistance as well as determine if continuation grants are to be awarded each year. Schools having the highest number of students performing below the proficiency level shall receive assistance from the state's consultants in reading and mathematics as well as assistance for brokering good professional development from all program consultants. These action steps will supplement the action bullets delineated in Part II, Sections 4 and 5 that follow.



4. Statewide System of Support Under Section 1117 for Ensuring that All Schools Meet the State's Academic Content and Student Achievement

- a.** The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide professional development to schools identified as in Need of Improvement through the following strategies:
- Distinguished educators who are master teachers will go into schools to model classroom teaching, provide teacher study groups, consult with local leadership and serve as a conduit between the State and school staffs. These distinguished educators will be provided in mathematics and literacy.
 - Best Schools, a New Hampshire initiative, will, in part, target Schools in Need of Improvement, low achieving schools and high poverty schools to provide resources not otherwise available. Some resources will be targeted to data gathering for needs assessment, curriculum support, community/parent involvement and planning and professional development around locally identified issues tied to student performance.
 - The Department is in the discussion stage of investigating a regional collaborative approach to support all schools but will prioritize its high need schools. This model will support schools in diverse ways and will ensure that professional development is provided in all regions of the state. It will build on a multiple set of resources and incorporate into its mission the goals and priorities of the *No Child Left Behind Act*.
 - The Department will identify a network of key educators who have expertise to support low performing schools. Department staff will provide training as necessary to these individuals around the specific goals and intent of the *No Child Left Behind Act*.
 - The Department will work closely with both the Lab at Brown and the NE Comprehensive Center staff to develop trainings and support for Schools in Need of Improvement and other high need schools. The State will meet with them annually to set goals and determine resources and supports needed to eliminate duplicative efforts and maximize resource potentials.



5. Standards Including How the State Will Provide Assistance to Low-Performing Schools

a. Schoolwide schools

The New Hampshire Department of Education will assist eligible high poverty Title I schools and Title I Schoolwide schools in the following manner:

- Provide technical assistance meetings throughout the year explaining the purpose, required components, and benefits of operating Title I Schoolwide programs to all schools that meet the forty-percent poverty threshold in the law.
- Encourage potential schoolwide schools to attend the Title I Schoolwide Congress sponsored jointly by the NE Comprehensive Centers and Departments of Education.
- Encourage existing schoolwide schools to continue to attend the Title I Schoolwide Congress sponsored jointly by the NE Comprehensive Centers and Departments of Education.
- Invite Schoolwide schools to participate in any school reform or school improvement workshops.
- Encourage Schoolwide schools to participate in Best Schools and Comprehensive School Reform initiatives.
- Provide technical assistance in the form of telephone contact, email, mail, on-site visits and workshops.
- Assign one of the New Hampshire Department of Education Title I staff to be the primary contact for all schools and school districts for Schoolwide reform. This position will conduct on-site visits and monitor Schoolwide schools, support those schools that will be beginning their planning process, disseminate information and work with LEA schools to enable them to clearly understand the program requirements, and will act as the Department liaison to the NE Comprehensive Center to support further Schoolwide initiatives.
- Provide technical assistance by thoroughly explaining AYP requirements to assist Schoolwide programs to meet the requirements. Further technical assistance will be provided, if necessary, to support the school's plan to reach high standards through coordination with other state program initiatives.
- Work with LEA's to reduce the accounting barriers so that Schoolwide schools can easily consolidate federal, State, and local funds by providing technical assistance both internally and externally for LEA bookkeepers, offer workshops and sessions to help LEA's better understand the flexibility process for administering a Schoolwide program.
- Identify high poverty schools in the state as one priority for support in all state initiatives (i.e. Best Schools). Target Title I Schoolwide Schools and Title I Schools in Need of Improvement for statewide systems of support.

b. To assist high poverty schools to ensure that all their teachers become highly qualified by 2005-2006, New Hampshire will solicit and fund proposals from IHE's to provide teachers with the necessary coursework and mentoring to become fully certified. Distinguished educators will be provided to schools for onsite mentoring and technical assistance. RFP's will be issued for paraprofessionals, discussed in 5.c. below. Title I funds for professional development and Title II funds will be used to enable teachers and paraprofessionals to become highly qualified. Coordination will take place at the local level through the district's Consolidated Applications and at the State level through the Title II IHE contracts as well as through the technical assistance and professional development organized by the New Hampshire Department of Education. Through the Consolidated Application technical assistance, districts will understand strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, such as financial incentives as well as reimbursement for course work.

Through the Local Consolidated Application, New Hampshire has provided a system for schools to link their federal No Child Left Behind Title II plan with the Professional Development Master Plan required of each district to help ensure all teachers teaching in core content areas are highly qualified by 2005/2006. A portion of state activity money will be used to help high poverty area and low performing schools develop or revise local professional development and hiring plans to ensure that all teachers teaching in the school district are highly qualified by 2005/2006. Staff from several bureaus will work together to coordinate the State's response to the district's alignment of their Professional Development Master Plan and No Child Left Behind Local Consolidated Applications. These staff members will develop a plan for high poverty and low achieving schools that will include: improving teacher preparation; improving professional development and specifically the evaluation components of local Professional Development Master Plans; attracting quality school administrators and teachers; increasing retention of new teachers and principals through mentoring and other supports; supports for increasing the quality of paraprofessionals and improving the alternative credentialing processes.

This Team will make every effort to offer technical assistance in two focus areas to coordinate with the State's efforts. These efforts include two State Board of Education initiatives that will be augmented by the ESEA State efforts. The first is the implementation of mentoring and induction guidelines for new teachers and principals. A State Task Force is currently engaged in developing these guidelines. State activity funds will be used to enhance and accelerate the dissemination of these guidelines and to provide technical assistance in their use, especially in high poverty and low achieving schools. The second initiative focuses on the development of an effective school support delivery system. This system will link existing efforts and coordinate the use of local and state funds to improve classroom instruction.

c. A significant part of the work of the Professional Development Cross-Bureau Team described above in 5.b. will focus on increasing the quality of paraprofessionals. The plan will ensure that paraprofessionals will have completed at least two years of study at an institution of higher education; obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local

academic assessment, knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing, reading, writing, and mathematics; or knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness, as appropriate. The Cross-Bureau Team will ensure that some Title I and Title II local funds are available for professional development of paraprofessionals. It will also ensure that partnership grants under Title II Subpart 3 “Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships” also offer targeted educational opportunities that support this effort.

d. The regional support centers for technology described in the competitive subgrant section of this application will enable all New Hampshire schools to access support in the use of instructional technology by year five of funding. Priority will be given to LEAs with a high need for technology, high numbers or percentages of children in poverty or low performing schools.

e. To promote parental and community participation in schools, New Hampshire educators, administrators, parents, policy makers and business people from across the state have established challenging curriculum frameworks that identify what New Hampshire children are expected to know and be able to do in the Arts, Career Development, English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.

- The New Hampshire Department of Education and Local Educational Agencies organize yearly community presentations on the use and interpretation of state assessment results.
- Reports are sent to parents and schools to help interpret assessment results. A final Statewide Summary Report for each grade is disseminated.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education has contracted with a public relations firm to assist in reporting and disseminating the data to the public through various New Hampshire news media, including newspapers, radio and television stations.
- Each school district, including all schools served under Title I, report to the Department of Education its data for the previous 12 months on its school and district performance indicators including:
 1. Attendance and drop-out rates;
 2. School environment indicators, such as safe schools data;
 3. Proportion of graduating students going on to post-secondary education, military service, and the workplace;
 4. Performance on state tests administered pursuant to RSA 193-C and other standardized tests administered at local option, as well as performance on locally developed indicators and assessment measures.
- Web-based public report card is posted on the New Hampshire Department of Education website on the condition of education statewide and on a district-by-

district and school-by-school basis. This report includes demographic and student performance data including, but not limited to:

1. School and district performance on state tests administered pursuant to RSA 193-C; and,
2. Disaggregated assessment data within the State, LEAs, and school by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities as compared to non-disabled students, and by economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged.
3. Other standardized tests administered at local option by at least 25 percent of school districts, as well as other relevant statistics; and
4. Comparisons with state averages and with the condition of each district and school in comparison with previous years are provided.

Activities to specifically address Title I Part A will include:

1. Beginning in school year 2002-2003, the New Hampshire Department of Education will review local educational agency (LEA) parent involvement policies and practices in those LEAs which receive Title I Part A funds.
2. Information, technical assistance, and monitoring assistance will be provided to LEAs receiving Title I Part A funds to ensure compliance with requirements contained in Sec. 1118. Parental Involvement.

f. Describe the activities the state will conduct to secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system

The Department of Education has identified two working groups in regards to the development of our AYP process. A cross-disciplinary internal accountability team has been meeting and is currently working on assisting the department to meet its federal AYP requirements. In conjunction, the Department has also organized an external ESEA group to look at all the broad implications of ESEA and specifically, to make recommendations on AYP. Both of these groups include a diversity of individuals representing local and statewide organizations, school districts, teacher organizations, community groups and the needs of special populations. In addition, the Title I Committee of Practitioners will meet to advise the department on a draft of its AYP decisions/baseline document.

It is the intention of the New Hampshire Department of Education to come to agreement on baseline data/ AYP definition in January of 2003. We anticipate that once the data is available, we will determine New Hampshire's baseline. All work on the baseline data

will be completed and information will be submitted to the US Department of Education in time to meet federal deadlines.

6. Community Involvement in the Plan

a. The Commissioner of Education and SEA officials have consulted with the Governor throughout the process of the state plan development. The state plan was approved by the Governor on June 7, 2002.

b. State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs with State-level activities administered through the Department's organizational structure. One Bureau houses Titles I, IIA, III, IV, and V. Other offices and bureaus, that are an integral part of the ESEA work include the following: the NHEIAP bureau in the Commissioner's Office responsible for assessment, standards and AYP; the Professional Development Bureau working with Title I evaluation, AYP, the administration of Title II subpart 3 for IHE's and the IASA Title II Transition to Teaching Grant; the Educational Technology Office administering No Child Left Behind Title IID, the Career Development Bureau which administers the Carl Perkins Act vocational education funds, and the Bureau of Credentialing. All these groups work together within cross-bureau teams sanctioned by the Department leadership. The ESEA effort is lead by the Deputy Commissioner, assisted by the Division Director of Instructional Programs. Coordination of ESEA-funded programs with State-level programs and activities is carried out through the Department's Coordinating Council which includes every bureau in the Department and the Department's cross cutting teams described above. These persons have overseen the writing of this plan, a highly coordinated effort on the part of the New Hampshire Department of Education.

An overview of the No Child Left Behind Act was presented to the Committee of Practitioners in April 2002 to begin to solicit their input to the application. The Committee will be kept apprised of the application throughout the draft and comment process. This team will be responsible for recommending to the Commissioner the target performance indicators for New Hampshire and for recommending the data systems for collection that will need to be in place.

c. State officials have coordinated and will continue to coordinate with other organizations. Nonprofits and businesses have been consulted for the creation of the state's 21st Century plan through a focus group. Nonprofit organizations have met to assist with the writing of the State Application for Even Start. Reports have been written for these focus groups and the reports have been distributed back to the participants for comment. The same procedures were used with the providers of services to migrant students. The migrant program does a unique job of keeping constant contact with businesses that employ migrant labor in New Hampshire and plans to have a forum with all the stakeholders, including the personnel managers. IHE's are scheduled to have a forum and information session on the new No Child Left Behind Title II IHE legislation in July.

The Commissioner created an External ESEA Management Team to consult on the Accountability Section of No Child Left Behind Title VI. The team is composed of New Hampshire Department of Education personnel, superintendents, school officials, school board members, and these groups' representative organizations, i.e., the School Board Association and Superintendent's Association. These recommendations will be provided for review and comment to the Workforce Investment Council in November 2002. The Workforce Investment Council oversees NH's Workforce Investment Act and is made up of businesses from across the state; its members are appointed by the Governor. IHE's serve on the Literacy Partnership, and the Committee of Practitioners. Nonprofit organizations serve on the Even Start Initiative, the Committee of Practitioners, and the Literacy Partnership. These organizations and advisory committees serve as vehicles for coordination of programs.

d. The New Hampshire Department of Education Internal Management Team, mentioned above in b, is representative of many of the staff working on No Child Left Behind initiatives. As mentioned, the Team includes a representative from the Bureau of Career Development that oversees the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act and a representative from the Office of Guidance and Counseling that oversees the New Hampshire Competency-Based Assessment System. Both represent programs in the Workforce Investment Act. Additionally, a representative from the Special Education Bureau that oversees the IDEA Act is also included. The Director of Head Start attended a focus group on No Child Left Behind and its literacy initiatives as did a consultant for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act. The consultant for the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act works in the Bureau with No Child Left Behind Title I team and has been a member of a coalition of McKinney providers. She has been a respondent on this State Application. Additional persons representing federal initiatives that have consulted to the Application include the Department Bureau Administrator for Statistical Services, the consultant responsible for the federal initiative Arts in Education Model Development and Dissemination Program, and the consultant for Service Learning authorized under Americorp.

7. Strategies New Hampshire Will Use To Determine On A Regular Basis Whether LEAs, Schools, And Other Subgrantees Are Making Satisfactory Progress

New Hampshire administers the state assessment each spring. Results are issued in the fall. Then schools will be identified as Schools In Need of Improvement. At that time, school and State officials will assess the schools accountability on performance indicators, analyze state performance targets, and set plans for the school year to address the needs of those schools with the poorest performance based on the state's data collection and accountability indicators and standards. All programs will be required to provide the necessary data to make these analyses and to assist the state to make yearly or biyearly performance reports to USED. New Hampshire has developed an elaborate data system in ensure confidentiality. This will continue to be maintained. The appeal process for AYP is rigorously followed. The office of Technology Management in the Department continues to help the Department to collect data electronically. The Office just completed a database for Title III, Title I and for Even Start Performance Indicators which all ES programs around the State will be able to use.

Progress of subgrantees is discussed in Part II, Section 3, Page 27.

GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427

The State will address GEPA by requiring all local applicants receiving Federal assistance for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs to address how they will make accommodation for these needs. Within the state activities the State will ensure translators and/or print accommodations will be available for participants in need at any function conducted as a State activity; review civil rights procedures for hiring and certification requirements to make sure they are in compliance with ADA and civil rights regulations; work with institutions of higher education offering teacher preparation programs to design and implement courses of study focusing on accommodations for special needs, and civil rights issues in education.

Consolidated Administrative Funds

The SEA plans to consolidate State-level administrative funds. New Hampshire contributes 818M in Adequacy Aid funding to LEAs in the State. Federal funds to New Hampshire constitute less than half of this amount.

Transferability

New Hampshire will transfer 50% of its State level activity funds under Title V to Title IIA State Activities.

| From: | Amount | % | To: |
|---------|-----------|-----|----------------------------|
| Title V | \$143,365 | 50% | Title IIA State Activities |

These transfers are eligible under the statute.

PART III: ESEA KEY PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS AND FISCAL INFORMATION

1. Title I, Part A -- Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs [Goals 1, 2, 3, 5]

a. New Hampshire's reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities

New Hampshire will set-aside 5% to support ongoing professional development for schools to meet the goals articulated in this document. We will prioritize our efforts in the following manner: schools in corrective actions, school improvement schools, schoolwide schools (in planning and in beginning implementation stages), and then all other Title I participating schools. The Department is in the process of designing support through a school support system. This model will support the provision of professional development services in all regions of the state. Title I set-aside dollars will be used to build on existing resources to further support our most needy schools. Professional

development activities such as the following could be offered: 1) review and analysis of data and the use of data for decision making; 2) school improvement planning; 3) curriculum development, and 4) identification of a network of key educators that will support our most needy schools.

b. 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) will be made available to LEAs; New Hampshire will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and New Hampshire requirement for use of those funds

Each identified Title I School in Need of Improvement must, within 3 months of being designated, develop a school improvement plan which addresses, at a minimum, all the requirements outlined in section 1116. New Hampshire will award planning grants in an amount not to exceed \$5000 to support these schools in the development of their school improvement plans.

In addition, through an RFP process, all designated Title I Improvement Schools can request, on an annual basis, funds to fully operate and support specific components of their school improvement plans. Funds will be awarded through a formula basis using school poverty data (Free and Reduced Price Meal Eligibility Program). Requests for funds will be reviewed by a team made up of, if at all possible, school practitioners, department staff, representatives from higher education, representatives from the Lab at Brown or the NE Comprehensive Centers, distinguished educators and community members.

c. Administrative funds the State will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used

The State does not expect to use any of our Title I state administrative funds to support assessment development.

d. New Hampshire will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1167(e)(7) and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose

By the fall of 2003, the New Hampshire Department of Education will develop the processes and procedures for selecting service providers based on guidance from the US Department of Education. The New Hampshire Department of Education will involve the Title I Committee of Practitioners in this process. Once they are developed, staff will disseminate the information to all applicable school districts in the state.

Annually, LEAs in their first and second year of School Improvement will be invited to a training and provided with the New Hampshire Department of Education's list of approved providers. At that time, the Title I Office will review the requirements of Section 1116(e)(6) and (7) and elicit ways in which it can continue to support these school districts and parents to understand the requirements.

e. New Hampshire will use formula grant funds to assist in refining and developing the assessments required under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and IDEA-97

New Hampshire will use up to 20% (an amount not to exceed \$782,452 for the 2002-2003 school year) for administrative and technical assistance.

- providing enhanced management/administration of the state assessment system
- providing enhanced technical assistance to LEAs in content areas included in the state assessment system that support improved teaching and learning
- enhancing State and LEAs capability and capacity to manage, analyze, and report data
- strengthening the capacity of LEAs and schools to improve student achievement by providing enhanced technical assistance to the LEAs in the use of professional development strategies that significantly improve teaching and learning
- strengthening the capacity of the State and LEAs to collect, analyze, report, and track assessment and school improvement data
- providing opportunities for collaborations with higher education, especially in the area of educational research
- improving the dissemination of information of student achievement and school performance (e.g. enhancement of the State Report Card for the public; enhancement of a web-based data analysis tool)

New Hampshire will use at least 80% of the funds (approximately \$3,129,810 for the 2002-2003 school year) to be spent on standards and test development.

- developing the additional State academic content and student achievement standards and aligned assessments for those grades and subject areas not currently assessed, as well as develop alternate assessments as needed
- refining the current state assessments to ensure continued alignment with the state's standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials and practices
- ensuring the validity and reliability of state and local assessments (i.e. by establishing a technical advisory committee)
- developing alternate and multiple assessment measures to increase reliability and validity of state and local assessments
- expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities to improve the rates of ensuring the validity and reliability of state and local assessments (i.e. by establishing a technical advisory committee)

2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 -- Even Start Family Literacy [Goals 1, 2, 5]

a. and b. New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators are designed to guide and direct quality services through observable participant outcomes related to family literacy. New Hampshire's performance indicators set high, but realistic standards for Even Start programs. Development of a New Hampshire Department of Education Even Start

database is nearing completion. It is anticipated that data for the 2001-2002 program year will be entered during the summer of 2002. Data collected will include:

- percentage of newly enrolled families who are at or below the Federal Poverty Level;
- percentage of newly enrolled adults without a high school diploma or GED;
- percentage of newly enrolled adults who have not gone beyond the 9th grade;
- average number of hours of instruction offered per month for:
 - adult education
 - early childhood education, 0-2 years
 - early childhood education, 3-4 years
 - early childhood education, 5 years and older
 - parenting education;
- average number of hours of participation per month for each of the above mentioned program components;
- length of time Even Start families remain in the program;
- number of Even Start adults who gain at least ½ a grade level on reading and math subtests of the TABE;
- number of Even Start adults who demonstrate improved writing skills;
- number of Even Start adult English language learners who advance at least one level on the BEST;
- number of Even Start adults who obtain at least 50% of their literacy goals as identified in their family literacy plans;
- number of Even Start adults who earn a high school diploma or its equivalent;
- number of Even Start adults who achieve their goal of post-secondary education, job training or retraining, non-subsidized employment, or career advancement;
- number of Even Start children, ages three to five years, who demonstrate age appropriate skills on the *Brigance Inventory*, *Early Development*, *Response to & Experience with Books*,
- number of Even Start school-aged children who are reading on grade level;
- attendance data for Even Start children in grades one through three; and
- number of Even Start children in grades one through three who advance to the next grade level.

An initial statewide report, completed not later than December 2002, will set baseline data for the Even Start Program Indicators and guide the development of New Hampshire Department of Education's definition of sufficient program progress. By May 2003, we will identify what constitutes sufficient program progress and begin using that definition to guide decisions regarding Even Start continuation awards. Each Even Start project will be monitored throughout its four-year project period. Annual reviews will focus on the progress of each grant recipient in meeting the conditions of the grant, the New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators, and the objectives stated in the approved initial and continuing grant applications. The monitoring process will also address the amount and quality of services that are provided to eligible participants and a review of documentation of activities in the following areas:

- identification, recruitment, and enrollment;
- educational services for adults and children as defined in the application;

- collaboration activities; and
- fiscal management.

The reviews and reports will be completed on a schedule that permits their results to be used to guide project improvement goals for the subsequent program year.

Evaluation of Even Start projects will include review of the data collected through performance reports, financial status reports, and local evaluation reports. These data will include the collection of demographic data such as numbers served, and the type and scope of services provided. Projects will also be required to implement a rigorous and objective local evaluation conducted by an outside evaluator. Each Even Start project must submit an annual evaluation report to the New Hampshire Department of Education Even Start Office, and quarterly financial status reports to the New Hampshire Department of Education's Office of Budget Management.

c. New Hampshire's Even Start family literacy projects will ensure children of at-risk, low-income families have a higher probability of achieving to The New Hampshire State Frameworks for academic achievement by providing comprehensive family literacy services and using instructional programs that are based on scientifically based reading research (Section 1208), to the extent such research is available. The Even Start website will feature a link to the State Frameworks. Additionally, the Frameworks will be discussed at a monthly NH Even Start Grantees meeting in the fall of 2002. Currently, New Hampshire has no State standards for educating children ages 0 – 7 years. To increase the probability that New Hampshire Even Start preschoolers enter elementary school read to learn to read, activities for Even Start preschoolers will include reading readiness and transition to kindergarten activities that are based on scientifically based reading research, to the extent such research is available.

d. New Hampshire's Even Start allocation is \$1,127,000. Six per cent of this amount, \$67,620, will be reserved for State-level activities. Not more than one half (\$33,810) of this reservation will be used for administrative activities including, but not limited to, writing the request for proposals, organizing and facilitating the proposal review process, writing and reviewing Continuing Applications, and monitoring local program progress. The balance (\$33,810) of the State-level reservation will be used to provide technical assistance and carry out activities related to Sections 1240 and 1234(c). Use of these funds for this purpose will not result in a decrease in the level of activities and services provided to New Hampshire Even Start program participants. The remaining 94 percent (\$1,059,380) of New Hampshire's Even Start grant funding will be distributed to the five existing Even Start programs, selected in 1999 and 2002, and used to award at least two more competitive subgrants in the spring of 2003.

Initially, our State-level activities will focus on developing our statewide Even Start database and providing technical assistance to local programs regarding data collection and data entry. These activities will expedite the implementation of New Hampshire's Even Start Performance Indicators (Section 1240) and support the monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of local Even Start programs. Technical assistance activities, e.g. monthly grantees meetings, and high-quality workshops and training, will be aimed at local program improvement and capacity

building (Section 1234). The content of New Hampshire Even Start technical assistance and support activities are guided by a focus group of Even Start practitioners, and by a leadership team representing the Even Start Statewide Family Literacy Initiative Consortium.

The Even Start Focus Group, a subcommittee of the New Hampshire Committee of Practitioners, consists of early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, reading specialists, a Title I Director, and local Even Start program directors, who are experts on family literacy. This group convened in early May 2002 to guide the development of our State plan. The group identified the following technical assistance needs:

- Establish a technology base for implementing the New Hampshire Even Start Performance Indicators,
- Provide initial training and ongoing technical assistance for Even Start instructional and data entry staff,
- Provide training and ongoing support to local program coordinators for using Performance Indicator outcomes to guide program improvement, and
- Provide ongoing training and staff development to help programs effectively implement all 15 Even Start program elements.
- Priority areas:
 - 1) Staff qualifications,
 - 2) Coordination with other programs, and
 - 3) Identifying and implementing instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research.

The Even Start Focus Group will reconvene in July, 2002 to identify specific training topics and technology support needs.

Because New Hampshire is in the 3rd cohort of initiative states, its Consortium Leadership Team is newly identified, and has not yet addressed Even Start technical assistance priorities. This group will meet monthly beginning in May, 2002. Coordination of the Initiative and Focus Group efforts and priorities will be ensured through shared leadership (our Even Start Program and Even Start Statewide Initiative share a coordinator), and by two key partners' participation in both the Even Start Focus Groups and the Initiative Leadership Team meetings.

The remaining 94 percent of the State's Even Start grant funding will be distributed to the five existing Even Start programs, selected in 1999 and 2002 and will be used to award two more competitive subgrants in the spring of 2003.

3. Title I, Part C -- Education of Migrant Children [Goals 1, 2, 5]

a. The New Hampshire Migrant Education Program (NHMEP) functions both as a SEA and a LEA. Needs assessment takes place at two levels, state and local. The aggregated information from the statewide needs assessment determines the type and scope of services offered. Recognizing the need to revise its current needs assessment process, the State conducted a Focus Group meeting comprised of full- and part-time MEP staff. Based on this discussion, the State developed a new document and process for addressing

individual student needs which will be implemented in 2002 and will replace the current one. In addition, the consensus of the group, based on parent interviews, was that the single most important service to migrant families was tutorial assistance. Therefore, in summer 2002 and school year 2002-2003, the NHMEP will focus its efforts on effective tutorial assistance. Individual student needs assessment will be more comprehensive, thus ensuring that service matches need. The NHMEP will contact classroom teachers of all school age migrant children currently enrolled in the program before summer programming begins. They will complete a questionnaire regarding academic performance. As new students enter the program during the regular school year the NHMEP will contact classroom teachers in a timely manner. In addition, the family service providers will complete a needs assessment with parents of preschool and school-age children and out-of-school youth when they conduct initial home visits. Records will be collected for the summer term, for the regular school year and as new families arrive.

The State will conduct another Focus Group in the school year of 2002-2003. This group will include full and part-time MEP staff, parents, classroom teachers, business personnel and at least one school administrator. The group will discuss, evaluate, and make revisions to the needs assessment piloted during 2002. The State anticipates that ongoing revisions will be necessary.

b. The State Department of Education will be setting the State's performance targets. The New Hampshire Migrant Education Program will prioritize the use of funds in order to ensure alignment of its performance indicators with those established by the State. Provision of services to migrant students will reflect assessed needs for services as they relate to the State's priorities in order to ensure the full inclusion of migrant children in all applicable programs and planning.

c. The Migrant Education Program in the State of New Hampshire does not subgrant at this time.

As an addendum to its Consolidated State Application, the State of New Hampshire agrees that, in determining the amount of any FY 2002 and subsequent fiscal year MEP subgrants it will award to local operating agencies, it will take into account the following funding factors: 1) the numbers of migratory children; 2) the needs of migratory children; 3) the service priority under subsection 1304 (d); and 4) the availability of funds from other programs. Furthermore, the State recognizes that a condition will be attached to the grant award requiring that it submit to the Department, by September 1, 2002, a detailed description of how these factors will be used in the State's determination of its FY 2002 and subsequent FY MEP grants and contracts (including the weights assigned to individual factors).

d. The New Hampshire Migrant Education Program (NHMEP) has recently contracted with Management Services for Education Data to use the MIS2000 system. This will promote the continuity of educational data collection and interstate transfer of records in a timely manner. Currently, when children move interstate, New Hampshire utilizes the "Migrant Child Movement Notification System Form" in contacting the receiving state.

To this form we attach a copy of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). These records are faxed to the receiving state. New Hampshire receives records in the same manner from sending states. With respect to intrastate movement, all migrant student records are maintained at the state office by the two full-time MEP staff. When a child moves intrastate, NHMEP staff conduct a home visit, complete a new COE, a needs assessment, and service follow-up. This ensures that migrant children have access to all appropriate local, state, and federal programs, including Title I, ESOL, and SPED. In addition, districts receiving Title I funds are required to ensure and address in narrative form how they will serve migrant students.

With the increasing number of children arriving in New Hampshire from Mexico, we are currently asking other larger states for assistance in identifying the most effective way of transferring records between New Hampshire and Mexico.

e. In conjunction with the state's performance goals the NHMEP has identified the following evaluation components:

Evaluation:

- Documentation of all advocacy activities maintained at the state office
- Migrant students perform at or above the proficient range as determined by the state definition of AYP in reading/language arts and mathematics;
- Rates of promotion and high school graduation or equivalent at or above the state average;
- Annual Focus Group evaluation; and
- Parent surveys
- Documentation of services provided
- Documented follow-up on received interstate referrals and records maintained on referrals sent

f. Title I Administrative Set Aside accounts for approximately 3% of the NHMEP budget. These monies are used for travel and general administrative expenses. The Title I office provides the NHMEP with a .50 FTE secretarial support person. The Title I State Coordinator provides technical assistance to the NHMEP as needed.

The SEA will use NHMEP funds as follows:

The Migrant Education Program is unique in New Hampshire as we function as a SEA and a LEA. New Hampshire has no subgrantees, 100 % of the allocation remains at the SEA. All services are provided through the SEA.

Personnel accounts for 70% of our budget. Two program specialists are employed full-time to coordinate the Migrant Education Program in New Hampshire. Approximately 20% of their time is spent on administration and recruiting. The remainder of their time is spent on direct services, including advocacy, tutoring, and all other program activities. They report to the Title I State Coordinator and the Administrator of the Bureau of Integrated Programs.

Contracted services account for 10% of the budget. These contractors include recruiters, family service workers, tutors, and data management (MIS2000).

The remaining 20% is for office expenses, travel and professional development.

These percentages are based on the FY01 allocation. The anticipated allocation for FY02 shows an increase of 14.61%. A small portion of that increase will be used for the required SEA adjustment in fixed expenses. All of the additional monies will be used by New Hampshire Migrant Education Program to expand direct services to migrant children using the contracted services of tutors and family service providers.

4. Title I, Part D -- Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk
[Goals 1, 2, 5]

a. Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.

Inclusive in a LEA's application for funds, school districts set goals, objectives and performance indicators. These are reviewed by state staff for completeness and rigor. LEAs, as part of their program evaluation, annually submit a report to the NH Department of Education. This report includes a review of their accomplishments in meeting or exceeding their goals and objectives. Over the next year, the Department will move from a LEA system to a SEA developed system of accountability. See narrative on previous submission.

A group will be formed of agencies, ESEA titles and other federal programs with similar populations, as well as interested groups. With this core group, we will hold a series of consecutive work sessions to develop goals, performance indicators for this program. This group will act as an Advisory Group for the work of the Title I Program Office. The goals, objectives and indicators will be disseminated in draft to all applicable parties and then after a comment period will be finalized. Once completed, we will submit them to the USDOE for review and approval. We expect the work to be submitted for review no later than July 1, 2003.

Children and youth who are neglected, delinquent or at risk will be given the same opportunities for academic success and achievement as are available and expected of all New Hampshire students.

1. Attendance rates will be at or above the relevant district average.
2. Special education and related services will be provided to eligible students.
3. Appropriate services will be based on assessment of individual needs.

4. Parents or persons acting as parents of ND children and youth will participate meaningfully in their children's education.
 - Parents or persons acting as parents will be provided with individual student reports informing them of their child's specific academic needs and achievement on academic assessments aligned with state academic standards.
 - Parents or persons acting as parents will have opportunities to attend parent skills training.
5. Neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to participate in the New Hampshire State Assessment and meet New Hampshire State academic standards.
 - Performance on the New Hampshire State Assessment will be at or above the proficient level.
 - Rates of promotion to the next grade will be at or above the relevant district average.
 - Rates of high school graduation or equivalent will be at or above the relevant district average.

b. How New Hampshire will assist projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.

The State as part of both its LEA and SEA application process requests grant recipients to specify how they will support youth from correctional facilities. The Title I Office will identify through the review of those documents the degree of technical assistance and training needed to support programs.

In addition, within the next six months, the Title I Office will survey all applicable state and local agencies working with NH's neglected and delinquent populations. The survey will request information regarding strategies used and supports provided for the transition of youth from correctional institutions. The survey will also ask responders to identify ways in which the Department and its collaborators could support transition efforts. The Department will then summarize the data from the survey and determine next steps, including but not limited to follow-up technical assistance, training, dissemination of materials, identifying successful strategies and other such activities as needed.

New Hampshire Department of Education will assist applicable state agencies and school districts in support of their transition programs and activities for Title I participants. The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide technical assistance to education personnel in correctional facilities and school districts to better plan for the transition of students to locally operated facilities. Technical assistance will be provided in the following ways:

1. Opportunities for professional development for educational staff at correctional facilities regarding the academic and social needs of neglected and delinquent youth.
2. Updated information will be available on the New Hampshire Department of Education website.
3. Coordination with New Hampshire's grant from the U.S. Department of Corrections Reentry Project projected to assist youth offenders to re-enter their community through transition services and community based support.

c. How New Hampshire will reserve funds under section 1418 to provide transition services for students leaving institutions

As part of their State Agency's application for Title I, Part D, subpart 1 funds, the New Hampshire Department of Education will require the Departments of Corrections and Health and Human Services to detail the strategies that they will use (1) to facilitate the transition of children and youth from State-operated institutions to schools served and (2) to support the successful reentry of youth offenders in compliance with section 1418.

In addition, the Department will create a committee to outline possible transition strategies. We will encourage the involvement of key personnel from Vocational Education Workforce Investment Act, Special Education, Adult Education, Department of Corrections, Department of Health and Human Services and local practitioners to be part of this working group. The goal of the group will be to assist all parties to become better able to support the transition of children and youth from institutions to schools. The Title I office will facilitate the work of this group.

5. Title I, Part F -- Comprehensive School Reform [Goals 1, 2, 5]

a. The New Hampshire Department of Education will ensure, through the following processes and procedures, that the school reform programs which receive funding are high quality, well defined, well documented, and meet the criteria stated in the legislation.

- The New Hampshire Department of Education will select proposals that demonstrate the most promise for successful implementation and raising student achievement.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will give preference to school that elect to adopt a proven effective, scientifically based research, externally developed CSR model.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will use the eleven components identified by the CSR legislation to develop criteria to evaluate the quality of a school's overall reform plan.
- Schools that select a CSR model that does not address all eleven of the components must provide adequate information on how all eleven components will be met.

- The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide three workshop sessions prior to funding, explaining the history and purpose of CSR, overview of the eleven components, data collection, needs assessment, and the request for proposal process and scoring rubric guide.
- Each proposal will be read and rated, using a scoring rubric, by at least three grant reviewers comprised of persons from the New Hampshire Department of Education and peer reviewers each of whom have significant experience and expertise in CSR and grant reviewing.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide training to grant readers. The training will include a review of CSR, request for proposal, and scoring rubric guide.
- If an application is not rated good or exemplary in all categories, the New Hampshire Department of Education will provide feedback and technical assistance to the local education agencies.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will conduct on-site visits, using a scoring rubric, to all potentially successful grants.
- Preference will be given to districts that demonstrate a commitment to assist the funded schools with budget re-allocation strategies that will sustain the CSR Program after the three-year federal funding period.
- Preference will be given to districts that integrate the school's CSR Program with their Schoolwide Plan or Local Education Improvement Plan.
- Awards will be of sufficient size and scope to support the start-up costs for the comprehensive reform program selected (Section 1604(2) minimum \$50,000).
- Funded programs will demonstrate a coherent, interrelated effort rather than a fragmented or "add-on" approach.
- Once funded, the New Hampshire Department of Education will require each school to submit a Local Progress Report Form at the end of each implementation year pending additional funding.
- Schools must demonstrate that they are implementing the CSR program as outlined in their original plan, making adjustments to the plan as necessary and describing those adjustments in the Local Progress Report.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will determine, by analysis of the data submitted on the Local Progress Report, whether the school is making adequate progress toward meeting goals as outlined in the school CSR plan. The determination of progress will be based on a variety of factors, including the school profile, the external model chosen, and other issues unique to each school and district.
- If minimal student progress has been made during the first or second year of implementation, the school and the district will be expected to analyze the reasons for the lack of progress, and adjust the CSR plan for the second or third year of implementation. Additional technical assistance from the state support team may be required, and the school will be expected to work closely with the team to adjust the plan.
- School representatives must attend all required CSR workshops during the three years of implementation.

- The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide technical assistance in the form of telephone contact, email, mail, on-site visits and workshops.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will provide technical assistance in the form of at least two networking meetings per cohort to all CSR schools each year.
- The New Hampshire Department of Education will hire a half time person to conduct on-site visits and monitor CSR schools.

b. New Hampshire CSR Priorities Will Promote Academic Achievement

Each CSR school conducts yearly in-house local evaluations. Their reports reflect data collection on the eleven components of CSR as well as student performance based on the New Hampshire Educational Improvement Assessment Test. Working with the school districts the New Hampshire Department of Education will assist schools in collecting and disaggregating the results of the state assessment for each school. Reflections on this data are an integral part of each school's continuation application.

6. Title II, Part A -- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
[Goals 1, 2, 3, 5]

a. New Hampshire will set its annual measurable objectives by May 2003. The State will collect baseline data for highly qualified teachers for the 2002-2003 school year through the Title IIA local plans needs assessments.

Additional state activities will include:

- Establish a statewide steering committee of LEAs to design a professional development needs assessment process.
- Conduct regional technical assistance to assist districts to do local assessments of their professional development needs that link teacher learning to student progress in the New Hampshire curriculum frameworks.
- Enhance and develop statewide a teacher evaluation system to inform the needs assessment process.
- Provide regional professional development to assist districts to improve continual ongoing needs assessment.
- Enhance alternative certification processes through New Hampshire Bureau of Certification.
- Coordinate with Troops to Teachers and Transition to Teaching grants as well as No Child Left Behind Title IID.
- Support new guidelines for mentoring and induction as well as continual support of the use of electronic resources.

b. Local LEAs will be held accountable for 1119(a)(2) through the submission of their Local Consolidated Plans. These plans will be reviewed to ensure that 1) they set forth procedures to have all teachers become highly qualified not later than the end of 2005-2006 and 2) professional development the LEAs offer their staff is consistent with the definition of professional development in No Child Left Behind Title IX.

c. The New Hampshire Department of Education serves as the IHE for the state. Through the competitive grant process New Hampshire issues competitive RFPs to state agencies for higher education; New Hampshire will retain for administration the amount \$17,390.95 that it received in the preceding year for the administration under Title II, ESEA Eisenhower Professional Development Program.

7. Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology [Goals 1, 2, 3]

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2002) offers New Hampshire an opportunity to comprehensively plan for improved educational outcomes throughout the state. Although the New Hampshire Educational Technology Plan directly addresses the state's educational technology vision, it provides the initial steps for the New Hampshire Department of Education to combine efforts with regional centers for a school support delivery system.

Funding received through Title II Subpart D: Enhancing Education Through Technology (E2T2) from No Child Left Behind and local school district (LEA) dollars will create the foundation for this support delivery system in the first years of this plan. In subsequent years, funding will be leveraged from foundation and other grant opportunities, including federal funding within other titles under No Child Left Behind. New Hampshire has also begun the process of seeking state funding to coordinate with this initiative. This plan is an attempt to consolidate educational technology initiatives in a comprehensive statewide plan aimed at improving New Hampshire education.

a. Program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that New Hampshire has established are all outlined within the State Educational Technology Plan available at our web site: [www. http://nheon.org/oet/stateplan/nhttp2002.htm](http://nheon.org/oet/stateplan/nhttp2002.htm). All of these items will be the focus of our proposed Educational Support System. Therefore, the Educational Support System is the method for making certain the New Hampshire State Educational Technology Plan is implemented.

b. The New Hampshire Department of Education long-term strategies include sustainability of the Educational Support System. That is, the path to improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy is to provide resources and information to educators about scientifically-based good educational practices and then supporting the implementation of those practices. The New Hampshire State Educational Technology Plan demonstrates a recognition of the need to focus on professional development delivery and supports as well as access to technology tools.

c. Five percent of the Title II-D funds retained at the state level (\$153,957) will be used for outreach activities to promote technology assessment tools, on-line professional development activities, and other initiatives from the Office of Educational Technology. A current list of these initiatives is available at www.nheon.org/oet and further described within the State Educational Technology Plan.

d.

i. The Educational Support System project equitably distributes our resources across the state. Criteria as outlined for these projects specifically requires high need school districts to be key players in the Support System as well as being the primary focus for receiving services.

ii. All applications for New Hampshire discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program will be administered through the Office of Educational Technology. A full-time Educational Technology Consultant position will be responsible for disseminating information, scheduling outreach, and coordinating the implementation of these funds.

8. Title III, Part A -- English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement
[Goals 1, 2, 3, 5]

a. Review of LEA plans will ensure that local practice reflects scientifically based research. To facilitate technical assistance, the SEA will review research conducted by the conservative Research in English Acquisition & Development (READ) Institute as well as by Dr. James Cummins, Dr. Stephen Krashen, and Dr. Virginia Collier, whose work promotes the use of two-way bilingual programs as the most effective method for teaching English to LEP children. The SEA will conduct outreach to all districts with a series of information sessions with ESOL district coordinators and other administrators that outline the change and enhancements to existing instructional practices in the state. Further, the state's compliance guide, *Equal Education Access for Students with Limited English Proficiency*, will be reviewed and expanded upon with a section on scientifically based instructional models.

Flexibility will be given to those districts that have low-incidence LEP populations and therefore do not have enough students to establish self-contained ESOL classrooms or resource rooms. Such districts frequently offer ESOL pullout sessions only, although research indicates this is not the most effective instructional model. The SEA will provide technical assistance to low-incidence districts in the best instructional methods to use with the ESOL pullout model that will respect local needs and circumstances but also provide the most effective instruction possible.

b. The SEA will hold subgrantees accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives by collecting testing results data on limited English proficient students in grades 3, 6, and 10, adding an additional grade to be tested each year. Adequate yearly progress will be disaggregated for LEP students annually. The precise percentage of improvement will be determined by the ESOL curriculum planning groups by January 31, 2003.

c. The SEA will reserve the small state minimum of \$175,000 in order to carry out professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and monetary recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. This will be allotted in the following way:

Professional Development: 27%

Planning, Evaluation, Administration, and Interagency Coordination: 25%

Technical Assistance: 42%

Monetary Recognition Awards: 6%

d. Two (2) percent of the State's allotment will be reserved for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.

e. The process that the State will use in making subgrants to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth will be to consult the most recent data to determine which districts are eligible and request those districts to submit a proposal outlining their needs and the program they propose to address those needs.

f. According to the October 1st LEP ID Count for the 2001-2002 school year, New Hampshire has 3,286 limited English proficient children in the state.

g. According to the February 1st Immigrant Count for the 2001-2002 school year, New Hampshire has 1,981 immigrant children and youth in the state.

9. Title IV, Part A -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities [Goal 4]

a. Key Strategies

Key Strategy: Program Coordination

The reauthorized Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities legislation requires a well-coordinated SEA and Governor's Program, a provision supported by New Hampshire state statute. With the passage of legislation in 1999, the New Hampshire General Court established the Governor's Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment. Commission members include state agency commissioners, the state attorney general, and private sector officials and practitioners. The Executive Director of the Commission is the Director of the New Hampshire Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery, administering agency for the Governor's Program.

Among the duties with which the Commission is charged are several which are consistent with Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program requirements and principles:

- to ensure that state and federal resources support quality programs grounded in scientifically-based research;
- to engage in a stronger effort to solicit public input to identify emerging needs and program gaps;
- to design and implement a coordinated plan to reduce the impact of alcohol and drug abuse problems on New Hampshire citizens, especially young people.

The New Hampshire Department of Education (SEA) and the administering agency of the Governor's Program, the Division of Drug and Alcohol Prevention and Recovery (DADAPR) within the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, are

Commission members actively involved in the work of the Commission's Prevention Task Force. The Task Force oversees several Commission initiatives, such as

- developing a coordinated operation among state agencies to streamline and clarify application processes for prevention funds
- developing a cooperative agreement among state agencies regarding the use of common standards for review and approval of grant applications that is based on best practices and research; and
- developing a coordinated technical assistance plan to avoid duplication of efforts.

Through its work on the Commission's Task Force, the SEA and the Governor's Program administering agency (DADAPR) will continue to coordinate their plans to

- **Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the ESEA**

Governor's Program awards will be prioritized to enhance and support, but not duplicate LEA activities by focusing on populations that need special service or additional resources not normally served by State or local educational agencies, such as youth in juvenile detention or court diversion programs, pregnant and parenting teens, homeless children and youth, and school dropouts.

Special consideration will be given to proposals demonstrating a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes the provision of mental health services related to drug and violence prevention in their program, in accordance with section 4112 (a)(3).

- **Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a)**

The SEA and the administering agency of the Governor's Program (DADAPR) have adopted and imbedded the principles of effectiveness in all application documents and technical assistance practices. The principles are consistent with the logic model of prevention planning endorsed by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention and the Center's technical assistance partner, the Northeast Center of Applied Prevention Technology. The Northeast Center has worked with SDFSC SEA and Governor's Program Coordinators in Region I to integrate the logic model and the principles of effectiveness into state and local programs and practices.

Key Strategy: Technical Assistance Coordination

The SEA and the administering agency of the Governor's Program (DADAPR) have developed a plan for use of SEA state activity funds provided under section 4112(c)(2) that supports the needs of LEAs and does not duplicate technical assistance provided by other state agencies. Multiple data sources were used to identify technical assistance needs, including LEA grantee and Governor's Program progress reports, results from the New Hampshire Youth Risk Behavior Survey, requests received from grantees or contractors through on-site or telephone consultation, and emerging needs identified through the Governor's Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment, and the New Hampshire Department of Education Safe Schools Committee.

State activity funds provided under section 4112 (c)(2) will be allocated to support the following:

- The administering agency of the Governor's Program (DADAPR) is the lead state agency for alcohol and other drug prevention. As such, it annually sponsors a statewide showcase of best practices for implementing scientifically-based prevention programs, with a special focus on the work of successful community coalitions in carrying out such programs. The conference planning committee is inclusive of the SEA and representatives from other pertinent state and local agencies. The conference is designed to strengthen school and community partnerships and attracts LEA representatives, community prevention specialists, parents, legislators, and interested citizens. The SEA will continue its current practice of allocating funds provided under section 4112 (c)(2) to support this conference.
- The SEA and the New Hampshire Office of Emergency Management are the lead state agencies for LEA technical assistance related to school violence. The SEA has established a Safe Schools Committee within the State Department of Education that operates collaboratively with the Office of Emergency Management which provides comprehensive crisis response and security training to LEAs. While this training is provided at no cost to LEAs through funds available in the Office of Emergency Management, the SEA will use SDFSC state-level activity funds to conduct meetings and forums for parents, LEA representatives, and relevant state and local officials to discuss emerging needs related to school security planning, especially in the areas of threat assessment and crisis response plans for bioterrorism.
- The SEA Safe Schools Committee partners with the New Hampshire Association of Mediators, the New Hampshire School Counselors Association, New England College, and local school safety and violence prevention specialists to plan and support classroom and schoolwide violence prevention programs such as peer mediation, scientifically-based programs of conflict resolution, as well as demonstration projects to address violence that is associated with prejudice and intolerance as authorized by section 4112 (c)(2)(D). State-level activity funds will continue to be used for LEA training and technical assistance in these areas, through grants or contracts to LEAs or qualified service providers.
- SEA state-level activity funds will be used to provide, directly by the SEA or through contracts, professional development seminars for LEA grantees and Governor's Program contractors to convene and share ideas for program improvement, showcase specific activities, learn about related state initiatives, and link with other ESEA programs. This is a practice valued by grantees and contractors from both the SEA and the Governor's Program.
- State-level activity funds will support technical assistance provided directly by the SEA SDFSC Coordinator, which includes
 - assisting LEA and Governor's Program recipients with identification and selection of scientifically-based programs and activities related to local needs;

- developing guidance and disseminating information pertaining to the use of scientifically-based programs;
- presentations and workshops to acquaint LEAs with state initiatives consistent with the purpose of SDFSC, and to assist LEAs in linking SDFSC efforts with related ESEA programs;
- on-site and telephone consultation services and assistance;
- correspondence with all grantees to provide resources and information for program development and improvement.

The administering agency of the Governor's Program (DADAPR) will use state and Substance Abuse Block grant funds to provide additional professional development and technical assistance to LEA and Governor's Program recipients, including

- scholarships to attend annual training events such as the New England Institute of Prevention Studies and the New Hampshire Substance Abuse Conference;
- developing and disseminating guidance pertaining to the Principles of Effectiveness and implementing scientifically-based programs;
- access to DADAPR's clearinghouse of alcohol and other drug information, curriculum resources, and educational videos;
- on-site and telephone consultation services and assistance; and
- correspondence with all grantees to provide resources and information for local program development and improvement.

Key Strategy: Monitoring Plan

The SEA will implement the following strategies to monitor LEA progress in meeting performance measures set forth in section 4114(d)(2):

- The SEA SDFSC Coordinator will conduct LEA on-site visits and telephone audits;
- LEA annual progress reports will be required, describing progress made in meeting LEA performance measures. The SEA will not issue new SDFSC grant funds to a LEA until a progress report is received;
- Quarterly LEA fiscal reports will be required to ensure that approved funds are expended in a timely manner;
- LEA data submitted in accordance with the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (section 4112 (c)(3)) will be reviewed to identify schools in need of additional technical assistance and support.

The administering agency for the Governor's Program (DADAPR) will implement the following strategies to monitor Governor's Program recipients' progress in meeting performance measures set forth in section 4114(d)(2):

- A Contracts Management Team will conduct annual site visits and regular telephone audits;
- Recipients will be required to submit quarterly progress reports keyed to the goals, objectives, and activities enumerated in the contract;
- A final report will be due within 30 days of the end of the contract period;
- No new contracts will be awarded before such reports are received and accepted;

- Monthly financial reports will be required to ensure that approved funds are expended in a timely manner. These reports will also serve as reimbursement requests as is required of all DADAPR contractors.

b. Performance Goals, Indicators, and Measures

Performance Goal

New Hampshire has adopted the No Child Left Behind performance goal “all students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning”.

Performance Indicators and Measures

Performance indicators for alcohol and marijuana use are consistent with Healthy New Hampshire 2010 objectives and reflect specific student behaviors and attitudes targeted by state and local agencies.

The biennial administration of the New Hampshire Youth Risk Behavior Survey will be the mechanism to assess progress in meeting performance measures. The 2001 survey results will serve as baseline.

INDICATOR: Percentage of students on one or more of the past 30 days carrying a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|
| 6.9% | 6.5% | 6.0% | 5.5% | 5.0% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students on one or more of the past 30 days who did not attend school because they felt unsafe at school or on their way to or from school

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|
| 5.7% | 5.5% | 5.3% | 5.1% | 5.0% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students during the past 12 months threatened or injured with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|
| 7.7% | 7.5% | 7.3% | 7.2% | 6.9% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students having at least one drink of alcohol in the past 30 days

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| 52.5% | 50.5% | 48.5% | 46.5 | 44.5% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students using marijuana one or more times in the past 30 days

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 28.4% | 26.4% | 24.4% | 22.4% | 20.4% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students on one or more of the past 30 days who have had 5 or more drinks of alcohol in a row within a couple of hours

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 32.1% | 30.1% | 28.1% | 26.1% | 24.1% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students who think people are at no risk of harming themselves if they smoke marijuana regularly

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|
| 1.1% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% | 1.0% |

INDICATOR: Percentage of students who think it would not be wrong at all for someone their age to drink beer, wine, or hard liquor regularly

| Baseline 2001 | 2003 | 2005 | 2007 | 2009 |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 17.7% | 16.7% | 15.7% | 14.7% | 13.7% |

Section c. Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS)

UMIRS Section 4112(c)(3) (i) and (ii)

The SEA will be the agency responsible for collecting and reporting data required by the UMIRS in accordance with section 4112(c)(3) (i) and (ii).

Plan and Timetable for Collecting Required Information

In 2000, the New Hampshire General Court enacted NH RSA 193-E:3, establishing the New Hampshire School District Profile Reporting System. This statute required the SEA to establish and implement a system for collecting and reporting, on a district-by-district and school-by-school basis, annual school profiles that include demographic and student performance data on state assessments, as well as general information pertaining to school safety. The specific data required by UMIRS (truancy, suspension, and expulsion data) is not required by this state statute.

While the collection of truancy, suspension, and expulsion data required by UMIRS is not required by state statute, the SEA will request that LEAs submit such data, if available, when submitting the data required by state statute for the 2001-2002 school year. Survey forms will be submitted to the SEA during the summer of 2002.

All LEAs will be required to collect and submit the data to the SEA for the 2002-2003 school year.

Timetable for Reporting Required Information

As this is a new data collection requirement for the SEA and LEAs, data collected for the 2001-2002 school year will be reviewed to better understand how LEAs currently collect and analyze such data. During the 2002-2003 school year, the SEA will provide technical assistance as needed to LEAs to ensure that all LEAs collect and report required data at the conclusion of the 2002-2003 school year.

During the 2002-2003 school year, the SEA will convene a school safety data work group and, with input from LEA representatives, develop a procedure for publicly reporting the 2002-2003 school year data that is aligned with existing reporting procedures required by state statute.

UMIRS Section 4112(c)(3)(iii)

The SEA will be the administering agency for collecting and reporting LEA data required by the UMIRS in accordance with section 4112(c)(3)(iii), and the administering agency of the Governor's Program (DADAPR) will collect data and report on Governor's programs and services.

Implementation Plan.

The SEA annually publishes a descriptive summary of LEA programs and services developed through the use of SDFSC funds, and disseminates such to legislators, LEAs, and interested citizens. The information is also available on the SEA web site.

DADAPR will publish a similar descriptive summary of programs and activities implemented through Governor's program funds.

UMIRS Section 4112(c)(3)(iv)

The SEA will be the administering agency, but will work in cooperation with the administering agency of the Governor's program (DADAPR) to collect and report data relative to the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth in schools and communities.

Implementation Plan.

Data will be collected through biennial administration of the New Hampshire Youth Risk Behavior Survey, in cooperation with the Centers for Disease Control Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System. Results of the survey are disseminated widely to interested citizens, the New Hampshire State Board of Education, LEA representatives, legislators, and are posted on the Department of Education web site.

10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 4112(a) -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor [Goal 4]

- a. The Governor will reserve twenty percent (20%) of New Hampshire's allocation received under section 4111(b) to award as competitive grants or contracts.

b. The Governor designates the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Recovery, as the administering agency of the Governor's reservation of funds.

Contact Information:

Kathleen Kopp
Contracts Manager
P) 603-271-6112
F) 603-271-6116
kkopp@dhhs.state.nh.us

Alternate:

Alice R. Bruning
Prevention Administrator
P) 603-271-6111
F) 603-271-6116
abruning@dhhs.state.nh.us

DUNS Number: 177802998

11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, Section 4126 -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants [Goal 4]

Describe how the SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.

In consultation with the Governor's office and the administering agency of the Governor's Program for Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities funds, a plan for funds made available under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126 was developed and is described in Part II, Number 2, (8) of this Consolidated State Application.

12. Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers [Goals 1, 2, 5]

New Hampshire will develop a database system to collect baseline data on State assessments in reading and mathematics for students participating in 21st Century Learning Centers. This baseline data will be collected for the 2001-2002 school year, and will be submitted to the US Department no later than early September 2002-2003.

13. Title V, Part A -- Innovative Programs [Formula]

From the funds made available each year to carry out this title, New Hampshire will distribute not less than 85 percent to the local educational agencies within the State of New Hampshire, according to the relative enrollments in public and private, nonprofit schools within the school districts of such agencies, adjusted , in accordance with the criteria

approved by the Secretary, to provide higher per pupil allocations to local educational agencies which have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher than average cost per child. The New Hampshire formula for distribution of funds to local educational agencies is as follows:

- 80% of the allocation will go to all LEAs and private school enrollments.
- 17% of the allocation will go to LEAs and private school enrollments where the percentage of Title I students is greater than 5% of the number of children enrolled in the public schools of the LEA.
- 3% of the allocation will go to LEAs and private school enrollments with children living in sparsely populated area.

- New Hampshire will reserve 15% of its Title V funds to support the following state activities:
 - Administration: 15%
 - Statewide education reform, school improvement programs and technical assistance: 35%
 - Transfer to Title II Preparing, Training and Recruiting Quality Teachers and Principals: 50%

14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111 – State Assessments Formula Grants
[Goals 1, 2, 3, 5]

New Hampshire's ESEA State activities will include:

- providing enhanced management/administration of the state assessment system
- providing enhanced technical assistance to LEAs in content areas included in the state assessment system that support improved teaching and learning
- enhancing State and LEAs capability and capacity to manage, analyze, and report data
- developing the additional State academic content and student achievement standards in aligned assessments for those grades and subject areas not currently assessed as well as develop alternate assessments as needed
- refining the current state assessments to ensure continued alignment with the state's standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials and practices
- ensuring the validity and reliability of state and local assessments (i.e. by establishing a technical advisory committee)
- developing multiple assessment measures to increase reliability and validity of state and local assessments
- strengthening the capacity of LEAs and schools to improve student achievement by providing enhanced technical assistance to the LEAs in the development of professional development strategies that significantly improve teaching and learning
- strengthening the capacity of the State and LEAs to collect, analyze, report, and track assessment and school improvement data
- providing opportunities for collaborations with higher education, especially in the area of educational research

- expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities to improve the rates of inclusions of such students
- improving the dissemination of information of student achievement and school performance (e.g. enhancement of the State Report Card for the public; enhancement of a web-based data analysis tool)

15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 -- Rural and Low-Income School Program
[Goals 1, 2, 3, 5]

a. The SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student achievement, hiring and retaining highly qualified teachers and increasing graduation rates will be set by the Department in May 2003. New Hampshire will request Rural and Low Income School program recipient schools to submit a plan that describes how they will use the funds to increase student achievement, hire and retain highly qualified teachers, decrease student dropout rates, or improve other educational factors. These goals and objectives identified by the LEAs must assist the State to meet the goals and objectives identified in Part I.

b. The state elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program by formula proportionate to the numbers of students in eligible districts.

Certification of Compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirement

The State certifies that it will review NH RSA 193:3 to determine whether this statute adequately establishes and implements a statewide policy that defines "persistently dangerous public elementary and secondary schools," and permits students in schools that meet the state definition of a persistently dangerous school to attend a safe public school.

Where the statute does not adequately address either of these requirements, the SEA will seek appropriate amendments to comply with the requirements by June 30, 2003.

APPENDIX A

June 2002

TO: ESEA Consolidated Application Reviewers

**FROM: Mr. J. Duke Albanese
Commissioner of Education
Maine Department
of Education**

**Mr. Nick Donohue
Commissioner of Education
New Hampshire Department
of Education**

**Mr. Peter McWalters
Commissioner of Education
Rhode Island Department
of Education**

**Mr. Raymond McNulty
Commissioner of Education
Vermont Department
of Education**

**RE: New England Collaboration on ESEA Enhanced
Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant**

We have agreed to collaborate in responding to the requirements of the ESEA Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant. We are doing so as the members of the newly formed New England Compact on Assessment.

The Compact's aim is to combine our perspectives, knowledge, and abilities in a partnership focused on student assessment and school accountability. We expect to benefit from economies of scale, increased power to attract high quality testing contractors, greater federal and private support, and increased federal flexibility.

Our shared philosophy will guide our implementation. Key elements are:

- ▶ Ensuring that All Kids achieve at high levels;
- ▶ Integrating standards and assessment;
- ▶ Enhancing state assessments, including assessments that support English language learners and students with special needs;
- ▶ Including local assessments that foster improved instructional practices;
- ▶ Providing technical assistance to districts and schools to build capacity to design, implement, and use assessments;

- ▶ Expanding the use of technology; and
- ▶ Communicating progress to all stakeholders.

It is the belief of the Compact members that these premises will support a truly integrated assessment system.

In the first place, a technical advisory committee, supported by the executive board and the policy advisory committee, will address:

- ▶ Assessment design;
- ▶ Scoring;
- ▶ Reporting; and
- ▶ AYP connections.

Should this initial work prove fruitful, additional resources will be requested to implement the collaborative effort. The proposed work plan is attached; the New Hampshire Department of Education will serve as fiscal agent.

THE NEW ENGLAND COMPACT

A Proposal

Overview

Establishing a New England Compact was motivated by a desire among the New England states to understand the *No Child Left Behind* act and its implications for assessment and accountability collaboration among the states. The states have met three times, (September, January and April) and have decided that a more formal partnership is needed in order to move forward. Those attending the meetings (see Attachment A) are encouraged that a partnership would provide the following types of benefits.

1. An economy of scale is the most apparent benefit. The fiscal savings are found in the development, scoring, and reporting of results.
2. State department capacities have diminished in almost every New England State in recent years. This work would reduce the current duplication of effort across all those who partner.
3. The potential of creating a test design that is both creative and of high technical quality is increased when working on a larger scale as is the potential for attracting the interest of test contractors and/or grants. In fact, the Gates Foundation has expressed interest in learning more about our efforts.
4. Teacher capacity to use classroom-embedded assessments and use the results to inform instructional decisions must be developed. Partnering with other teachers from across the New England region will expand perspectives and grow expertise among all involved.
5. There is an opportunity for states to negotiate with the federal government for more flexibility within the guidance in order to implement assessment systems that are comprised of both local and state assessments.

The meetings also surfaced the commonalities among the New England states with respect to both philosophy and practice regarding standards and assessment. We are proud of New England's reputation of providing high quality education to *all kids* and want to maintain our leadership in introducing innovative practices for their benefit. Everyone agreed that the collaboration would encourage our teachers and administrators to think outside of their local context and enrich what we all do. We understand that a partnership does not mean we are restarting our reform agendas, but rather refining them to meet the requirements of ESEA and respond to the collective learning of our efforts over the past ten years. Our shared vision for assessments includes local assessments that encourage improved instructional practices. In addition, we want to make better use of technology, communication to all constituents, and produce an assessment system that is truly integrated rather than a series of independent tests.

Components of the Compact

Governance-

Our discussions identified three components to the governance structure. The first is an executive board with a membership of commissioners, deputy commissioners, and superintendents. The second is a technical advisory committee representing the best thinking on assessment and accountability issues nationwide. This group could guide our work and ensure that it meets all requirements embedded in ESEA and our own concerns, (e.g. assessing all populations, embedding local assessments and scoring practices, aggregating data across different measures, etc.). A group of this type has membership including state testing directors, contents specialists, and psychometricians. The third component is a policy advisory committee comprised of business representatives, legislators, regents, higher educations, parents, and teachers.

The Work-

There are three areas of work on which we might collaborate. They are development of standards, assessment development- module based, and scoring and reporting of results. Regardless of the nature of the work, we hold true that we do not want to narrow the curriculum, assessments must be useful for instructional planning, there must be a timely return of data, we must allow states to maintain their uniqueness, and finally, we must do no harm!

1. Standards

At the time of our meeting, it was unclear whether ESEA requires grade level content standards or whether our current state structures of grade span standards would suffice. Regardless of the answer, it would be beneficial to work from a common set of content standards on which assessment systems would be based. Many states have standards or frameworks that need revision based on recent national work. Further, Jim Popham's recent paper forwards the idea of *super standards* which is a core set of standards that supercede other content standards in terms of their critical nature and, thus become the core of any assessment system.

The group raised a number of concerns and options regarding content standards. They include:

- a) Should there be one inclusive set of New England standards to which each state could map their own?
- b) Should the New England Standards represent a smaller commonality of the standards on which only the assessment system will be based?
- c) Should we develop grade range standards? For instance, grade 3-4, grade 4-5, grade 5-6, etc. knowing that the differences across grade levels is not easily determined.
- d) How can we be sure that the content standards account for all populations of children?
- e) What degree of compromise will be needed in order to develop New England Standards?

2. Test Development

Every state has a need to develop or identify assessment items or modules in order to supplement current efforts or to introduce new tests. No New England state has testing in every grade in place at this time. Any developmental work will consider each state's ongoing efforts and the needs to bridge to new plans for grade three through eight assessments. Everyone expressed a

desire to combine state and local assessments in a way that works together toward building a comprehensive and cohesive assessment system.

Some states expressed an interest in working together to identify what potential comprehensive systems might incorporate. As each state is able to articulate its system design, work can be done to identify where there is common ground across states. This juncture will help identify how we might support each other's work. These designs will identify the standards that will be measured, the range of assessment approaches to be used, (e.g. assessment modules, student work generated in classrooms, on demand performance assessments, multiple-choice items, projects, observations, portfolios, etc.), a multi-year map of how and when standards will be assessed, scoring protocols, use of technology, and reporting mechanisms.

Assessment modules, rather than individual items, will be developed around the common areas of assessment needs. Modules are a set of items or tasks that are validated together and used together. Rubrics, annotated anchor papers and a description of the cognitive complexity of the module will support these pieces.

Questions and issues were raised concerning test development. They include:

- a) Would it make sense to have benchmark grades that are tested, for instance grades five, eight, and eleven, and assessment systems that show progress for grades that lead up to each benchmark year?
- b) How can we build teachers' capacity to use students work and assessment results to inform instructional decisions?
- c) How can we have teachers help with the development of assessment modules?
- d) How could we vertically equate our assessments (both common and those unique to each state)?
- e) Would matrix sampling be allowed by ESEA?
- f) How can we transfer to these new assessment systems while ensuring that everyone in our communities, (educators, parents, lawmakers, etc.) understand the connections between the old and new programs?

3. Scoring and Reporting

The final area the group discussed was potential collaboration on the scoring and reporting of assessment results. The scoring of assessments is attractive because it provides help in two ways. There is a cost savings involved if states would like to send assessments to a contractor to be scored. Or, there could be a strong professional development piece embedded by having New England teachers score assessments from across the states.

Some states expressed an interest in exploring opportunities for common reporting mechanisms. The reporting could be for single assessments or might even explore how a number of assessments results could be compiled to provide an integrated profile of a students' progress toward meeting standards. This, of course, assumes common performance standards. However, as one participant noted, "We've all had experiences that others haven't and can profit from. It's time for less independence and more sharing.

All of us will end up with stronger programs for children as a result.” The questions and issues raised during this portion of the discussion include:

- a) How can technology support the scoring of student work by teachers?
- b) Can annotated student work samples placed on the web guide the scoring of assessments by teachers?
- c) How viable would it be to develop shared performance standards across states?
- d) How could we link performance expectations across a variety of assessments within and across states?

Next Steps

Our next steps are to continue meeting with commissioners, their deputies and assessment directors to discuss the work involved in forming a New England Compact on Assessment. Continuous conversations ensure that our planning in response to ESEA requirements reflect opportunities for partnership and agreements to move forward with our application for the competitive grant on enhanced assessment instruments. This funding will lead to the development of specific goals and objectives with the assistance of a Technical Advisory Committee. Expertise of this nature can support our commitment to provide all students with high quality assessments that address our diverse student populations and respect the role of teachers in the classroom.

***Goals for the New England Compact on Assessment
Assessment Enhancement Grant***

1. Develop a set of prioritized grade level content standards for all states joining the compact. A preliminary review of each state’s frameworks and grade span standards suggests that there is substantial overlap across the existing documents. A core document of agreed upon “super” or prioritized standards will form the baseline for cooperative assessment work across New England. These standards will reflect the developmental issues of young children and the learning differences among all children. A work plan will incorporate the facilitation skills of experts in the areas of standards, mathematics, and English language arts. Teams of practitioners from the New England states will form the teams of writers.
2. Convene a Technical Advisory Board, (TAC) of psychometricians and content experts who will advise and guide the Compact’s work. The core of the TAC will consist of representatives from each state’s existing TAC and mutually agreed upon additions that bring expertise not represented by current members. Specific issues that need to be addressed include:
 - aligning the set of prioritized grade level standards with each state’s existing frameworks or standards. Each state is concerned that curriculum is not narrowed as we respond to federal mandates to expand testing.
 - Aligning the common assessment work with the individual assessment design for each state. Members of the Compact have expressed a desire to develop a coherent system of assessments that complement each other and collectively, describe the growth and achievement of students toward standards.
 - Advising on AYP issues for each state.
 - Advising on vertical equating issues.
 - Advising on all technical aspects regarding classroom embedded assessments and standardized testing.
3. Develop a work plan for collaboration for assessment. The work plan will specify assessment development work for English language arts and mathematics, alternate assessments, and testing for English language learners in order to comply with ESEA. The collaboration will indicate specifics for cross-state work for developing open-ended writing prompts, assessment units, anchor papers, and possibly standard setting. The Compact states will also investigate products offered by testing vendors and determine what, if any, products would support the assessment design.
4. Develop a plan to enhance teacher capacity to implement, score, and analyze assessment results for instructional planning. This plan will anticipate materials needed, (technical manuals for local assessments, exemplars of annotated student work, etc.), the role of technology for sharing information and for assistance, opportunities for teachers across states to collaborate on developing local

assessments, selecting anchor papers, aligning curriculum, annotating student work, and sharing instructional strategies.

5. Secure additional funding through grant opportunities. With initial financial support through the enhancement grant, we expect to attract additional resources to continue and expand the work of the collaborative. The New England Compact will not only be fiscally wise, but it has the potential to form partnerships with universities, teacher unions, and governmental agencies.